School of Theology at Claremont
1001 1423108

The Library

SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY AT CLAREMONT

WEST FOOTHILL AT COLLEGE AVENUE
CLAREMONT, CALIFORNIA

946
G

READ BOTH SIDES, AND THEN JUDGE.

THE MIDDLEBOROUGH DISCUSSION:

A DEBATE

ON THE DOCTRINES OF

UNIVERSAL SALVATION

AND

ENDLESS PUNISHMENT.

HELD IN MIDDLEBOROUGH, MASS., ON JUNE 26TH AND 27TH, 1850

BETWEEN

REV. B. TODD, METHODIST,

AND

REV. E. H. LAKE, UNIVERSALIST.

FROM PHONOGRAPHIC NOTES, BY T. D. STETSON, EDITOR OF THE OLD COLONY REPORTER.

BOSTON:
STEREOTYPED BY HOBART & ROBBINS.
1850.

PREFACE.

THE circumstances under which this debate originated are briefly as follows: Last winter a citizen of Middleborough wrote Mr. Lake, stating that Mr. Todd was anxious to meet him in an oral controversy, on the doctrines of universal salvation, and endless misery; whereupon, Mr. Lake addressed Mr. Todd the following letter: —

To REV. B. TODD, *Pastor of the Methodist Church in East Wareham, Mass.*

DEAR SIR AND BROTHER: — It is with much pleasure that I have been informed of your willingness to meet me in a public discussion on the merits of our respective doctrines. It is a source of gratification to know that I am to have for my opponent one so favorably known to this community as a person of *integrity*, *candor*, and *learning*. I believe, sir, that a *sense* of *duty* and *love* of *truth* prompts you to meet me in an oral debate on one of the most thrilling questions that ever occupied the attention of men, viz., the *final destiny of the human family*. And I believe the discussion will be conducted in a good spirit, and be productive of great good. I understand it is the desire of many that the debate take place in Middleborough. To this I have no objection. In order that the whole ground may be canvassed, I propose the discussion be continued two days, the first of which shall be devoted to a consideration of the following question: — "Do the Scriptures teach the final holiness and happiness of all mankind?" The second day shall be devoted to a consideration of the question, "Do the Scriptures teach the doctrine of endless misery for any portion of the human race?"

P. S. An early reply is desired.

Respectfully yours, E. H. LAKE.

East Bridgewater, April 1st, 1850.

The report of the arguments on both sides was taken down by an impartial reporter, and it is believed that no esential points are omitted. Let it be remembered that Mr. Lake's articulation is very rapid, while that of Mr. Todd is more moderate, and, consequently, Mr. L. was enabled to say nearly twice as much as Mr. T. in the same space of time. It is hoped that both sides will read impartially, and that it will be the means of leading many to the fountain of eternal truth.

MODERATORS. { ISAAC KEITH, SANDWICH.
NOBLE E. BATES, ROCHESTER.
ALDEN ROUNSEVILLE, ROCHESTER.

School of Theology
at Claremont
A11527

DISCUSSION.

FIRST QUESTION.

"*Is there sufficient evidence for believing in the final holiness and happiness of all mankind?*"

MR. LAKE'S FIRST SPEECH.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS:—The assembled multitude before me prove the interest which is felt in the above question. It is a question exceeding all others in importance, involving the destiny of unborn millions. Let no one fear the cause of truth will suffer by passing through the ordeal of investigation.

"Imposture shrinks from light,
And *dreads* the curious eye."

But truth is eternal. She courts an inquiry, and bids us "prove all things, and hold fast that which is good." It is my prayer that this debate may be conducted in a Christian spirit, and be productive of great good.

There are three views held in regard to the destiny of the human family, viz., the *annihilation* of the entire race; the *endless misery* of a portion of mankind; and the *final holiness and happiness* of all human kind. All admit that *annihilation* is *preferable to ceaseless suffering*. Who would not prefer, when bending over the grave of some loved friend, to cherish the thought that he is quietly sleeping beneath the sod, than to be told that he is weltering in unceasing anguish? But I turn from the contemplation of these man-made systems, and invite your attention to another *view* of the destiny of the human race, which is fondly cherished by scores of Christians, not only in America, but in Germany. It is that of the

"restitution of all things," which Peter says "has been spoken by the mouth of all God's holy prophets since the world began." Acts 3: 21. To the defence of this benign faith, which, Paul says, is "the substance of things hoped for," my life and talents are consecrated. And here I have one advantage over my brother, viz., the prayers of all saints ascend for the salvation of all mankind. If you prayed last night, it was that I might show the happiness of all men is taught in the Bible. For there is no man in the world possessed of sufficient cruelty, who could pray for the endless suffering of his most bitter enemy. No matter how strong your faith may be in endless woe, you can neither *hope* nor *pray* for its truth. On the other hand, when death takes away some near friend, who gave no evidence of a change of heart, you gladly seek *refuge* in Universalism. A young man recently committed suicide in New York. His parents were believers in endless misery, and yet they could not give him up, and so they inscribed upon his tombstone the following inscription: "As IN ADAM ALL DIE, EVEN SO IN CHRIST SHALL ALL BE MADE ALIVE." 1 Cor. 15: 22. Well may Prof. Stuart say, "If this doctrine is true, it is worthy of a proclamation through heaven and earth." And God grant, for the sake of Jesus, and the *poor stricken mourner*, that I may show there is sufficient evidence for believing in the salvation of all mankind!

Before introducing my main arguments, to sustain the affirmative of this question, I wish to state what Universalism teaches. It recognizes the Old and the New Testament as a revelation of God's will and purpose, concerning the ultimate destiny of man. It teaches all will become happy, because all will be holy. It teaches an *adequate* punishment for *all* sin, —that punishment is a *means* of salvation,—designed for the *good* of the offender. It teaches that Jesus, in the room of saving men *in*, will save them *from*, their sins. I shall argue, at a proper time, that Jesus will accomplish what he came for, viz., *destroy* the *devil*

with all his works, and deliver the whole creation from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God. Rom. 8: 21.

1. There are various ways of proving the salvation of all men. We can prove it by reason. It is unreasonable to suppose that a God of love would create human beings, foreseeing that they would be losers by their existence. It is unreasonable to suppose that a father would punish his offspring endlessly for the sins of thirty short years.

2. We can prove the salvation of all, by the works of nature. The sun, the oldest Universalist in the natural world, dispenses his light and heat to all. The rains fall upon all; all breathe the pure air; all are fed by the products of nature. Indeed, we cannot go where "universal love smiles not around." Now, as the works of nature declare God good to all, and as the Bible asserts he is unchangeable, and whom he loves once he loves to the end, the inference is, he will not punish the objects of his mercy any more than will be for their benefit.

3. But we can prove the final salvation of all by the admission of learned divines. For instance, Dr. Beecher says, "He never contended that men will be punished endlessly for the sins of this life, but eternal punishment will tread upon the heels of eternal transgression." Prof. Stuart says, on the passage in the 6th of Romans: "He that is dead is *freed* from sin," means natural death. So, if what these two learned men say is true, there can be no punishment in the future life, as

> "Sin, the source of mortal woe,
> Can never enter there."

But there is another method by which to prove the salvation of all, viz., by putting together the concessions of Calvinists and Arminians. The former tell us *all* will certainly be saved for whom Christ died. Well, the latter tell us Jesus certainly died for *all*. Therefore the blood of Christ will prove efficacious in

the salvation of the world. "For he is the propitiation for our sins; and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world." 1 John 2: 2.

But there is still another way of proving the salvation of all, viz., by an appeal to the word of God. The Scriptures promise the arrival of a time when all things shall be restored to their original condition, when all men shall be *reinstated* in Christ. Paul, in the 5th of Romans, sets this argument forth in a masterly manner. He says, "Therefore, as by the offence, judgment came upon all men, *even so* by the righteousness of one, the free gift (not offer) came upon all men unto justification of life." Again, hear the Apostle: "For as by one man's disobedience many (*hoi polloi*, the *whole bulk of mankind*) were made sinners, so by the obedience of one shall many (the same number) be made righteous." Rom. 5: 19. If the same number that were made sinners are made righteous, what more can we ask? It is enough. Paul closes the chapter by saying, "Where sin abounded grace did much more abound. That as sin has reigned unto death, (which is the stopping-place to sin,) even so might grace reign unto eternal life, through Jesus Christ our Lord." Now if sin is to reign eternally, how can grace superabound?

Christ is the chief agent in the work of saving the world. Hence, in the 7th of Daniel, we read, "He shall finish sin, and make an end of transgression." Now as sickness is the absence of health, so *sin* is the absence of holiness. When sin is finished, transgression ended, what will there be left but universal holiness? Consequently, there will be no misery, because the sting of death, which is sin, will be taken away. 1 Cor. 15: 55. To place this argument upon an immovable foundation, I will quote from the beloved John. "For this purpose was the Son of God manifested, that he might destroy the works of the devil." When I was a school-boy, I was taught the philosophical fact, "that if the cause is removed the effect ceases." So, if Jesus destroys sin, misery, as its effect, must cease also.

I will now advance one step, and prove the destruction of the *devil himself*. See Heb. 2: 14. "Forasmuch, then, as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also likewise took part of the same; that through death he might DESTROY the devil, and *deliver* them who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage." *How many were subject to bondage?* Paul says, the whole creation. Then if the devil is to be destroyed, and the whole creation *delivered* from the bondage of corruption, what will *hinder* the final holiness and happiness of all mankind? Let my brother prove, that, after the devil is destroyed, he will roam forever through God's empire, with more than half under his dominion for whom Christ died.

I will now remove the superstructure upon which the doctrine of endless misery rests, viz., Hell. I will prove its destruction. Hear what the Prophet Hosea says: "I will ransom them from the power of the grave, (hell.) O *Grave*, (i. e., hades, hell,) I will be thy destruction." In the mouth of two or three witnesses every word shall be established. I will, therefore, quote from Paul, the great champion of our faith. Speaking of the resurrection of the dead, he says, "O *grave*, (or hell, as it is in the margin,) where is *thy victory?*" If more are lost than saved, as orthodoxy teaches, hell will gain the victory. Now listen to the language of the Revelator, 20: 14. "And death and hell DELIVERED up the dead which were in them." Sometimes we are told if they once get into hell they never can be delivered. But David says, "he was delivered from the *lowest* hell." Jonah was sent to hell, and there punished forever, and yet he was delivered. And we have no doubt all will be delivered on the same principle, and so "all nations shall come and worship before God." Ps. 86: 8. Hence John asserts, "that death and hell *delivered* up the dead which were in them." Let my brother try his skill, and get them *back* again if he can. And let him inform us how hell can be a place of punishment, after it is *destroyed*.

Well may we exclaim, in the language of Dr. Clarke, "Thus we find, that the salvation of sin here, is as extensive as the guilt and contamination of sin; death is conquered, hell disappointed, the devil confounded, and *sin* TOTALLY *destroyed.* Amen. Hallelujah. The Lord God Omnipotent reigneth. He shall reign forever and ever."

I have many more cheering arguments, in favor of the final salvation of all men. But my moderator tells me my time is out, and I must defer them until I rise again.

MR. TODD'S FIRST REPLY.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS:—I fully agree with my brother, in regard to the importance of the question which we have met to debate. It is a question of unutterable moment, around which our dearest interests cluster, involving the destiny of countless millions of mankind.

It becomes us to enter this debate with holy fear. We do not come here as combatants to defend creeds, but to learn and cherish correct views of God and his government. For my part, I enter this discussion with peculiar feelings. I have but little anxiety for the result. I cannot explain why. The question is certainly one of vast importance.

My brother says, "he has one advantage over me in this discussion, the righteous pray for the salvation of all mankind." But here I am obliged to differ from him, and for this reason. I have a desire to know and believe the truth, however unpleasant it may be to my feelings. I desire, and most fervently pray, that the *truth*, and not error, may abide in my heart. And I believe that all who have an immortal mind, have the same desire. The righteous esteem truth above all sophistry. So they pray that the truth, as it is in Jesus, may prevail, whether it be one form of doctrine or another.

My brother rests his faith in Christ, for the salva-

tion of men. So do I. But we travel in a different track, and, consequently, arrive at different conclusions. He views the position of the sinner, and the character of God and Christ, in an entirely different light from what I do. I am happy to stand in the position I do, in this discussion, not because it is in the belief of a fearful and endless punishment, but because I most firmly believe it to be true.

But my brother argues the salvation of all men, from "*the works of nature.*" I shall, I think, draw conclusive evidence, from the works of nature, that a portion of the human family are to suffer in a future state. What lesson do the works of nature teach, but that all who transgress the laws of the Almighty shall suffer the penalty? We see fixed and immutable laws governing every portion of the physical world, from the minutest insect, up to the highest arch-angel in bliss. True, God is a being of love, but this fact never prevents the transgressor from suffering the effects of laws violated.

But my brother says, "he can prove the salvation of all from the Scriptures." From this source I shall draw most of my arguments. Jesus Christ distinctly assures his disciples and the world, that "if men die in their sins, where he is they never can come." My brother dwells long and enthusiastically on the promises, but *not* on the conditions; he says not a word about the terms of salvation. I know no promises which are not conditional. Christ has opened a way for salvation, and I believe there is not a member of the human family but can be saved. Christ has accomplished all he came into the world to do. I hold, that through sin man is condemned. Before sinning, man was holy, and enjoyed, to the fullest extent, the delight of communion with God. But sin shuts up the way to his throne. Christ, by the glorious atonement, placed mankind again on salvable ground. "Behold," says John, "the Lamb of God, that taketh away the sin of the world!"

Our blessed Saviour has another office, but not in

this world. It is in heaven that he will finish his work. In his ignominious death, and glorious resurrection, he finished his work in this world, and his Holy Spirit was then sent to strive with the perverse spirits of men, and bring them to accept his terms.

But, from eminent divines, my brother offers to prove universal salvation. He quotes a few passages from their writings, to favor his views. But where he can quote one passage to favor his system, scores can readily be found completely demolishing it, and proving the opposite doctrine true, from the same divines.

But hell and the devil are to be destroyed. He argues, from the Greek word *hades*, that hell and the grave are synonymous terms. I think the word *hades* means an *intermediate* state between this and another world. He quotes Scripture plentifully, but I consider it of more importance to take the context into the account, to consider the subject upon which the writer is speaking. It has been often said, and with much force, that there is nothing so wild and whimsical, nothing so foolish or ridiculous, but can be proved from the word of God, if we disregard the connection. In the passages which my brother has quoted, the writer was evidently speaking of the righteous, those who should be saved. [*Time expired.*]

MR. LAKE'S SECOND SPEECH.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS:—In support of the doctrine of a world's salvation, I have introduced five arguments. I have argued the salvation of all men, from "reason, the works of nature, the admission of learned divines, the promise of God to restore all things, and the fact that Christ is to destroy the devil and all his works. What has my brother said to *weaken* these arguments? Why, he says these passages which I have quoted, refer to the righteous. But who were RIGHTEOUS when Christ came into the

world? (See Psalm 14.) Read the parable of the good shepherd, in the 15th of Luke, if you would learn whom Jesus came to save. Christ came to save *none* but sinners, as none but *they* need salvation.

But my brother says, he does not agree with me, that "I have the prayers of the righteous, for the truth of universal salvation," because he prays fervently for the truth, and he believes endless misery to be the truth, therefore he prays for it!! Well, a man must have a heart like adamant, that can pray for endless misery, be it *true* or *false*. According to his logic, we can prove universal salvation true, beyond the shadow of a doubt. He says, "we are not to pray for anything except the truth." Paul commands us to pray for the salvation of all men, and gives this as a reason, "for this is good and acceptable in the sight of God our Saviour, who *will* have all men to be saved, and come unto the knowledge of the truth." The inference from these premises is, that Universalism is true.

But my brother says, salvation is conditional. Admit it. Now let me quote two passages, as a specimen of what I shall quote, to show all shall comply with the terms of salvation. In Isa. 45, we read, that "God has sworn by himself, that every knee *shall* bow, and every tongue confess, that in the Lord they have strength and righteousness." In Heb., chap. 8, we read, "All shall *know* me, from the *least* to the GREATEST." So, if we can believe the Bible, all must comply with the conditions of salvation, as sure as God has taken an oath.

But my brother says, "he believes that there is not a member of the human family but can be saved." Will he tell us how he can believe so, when God *foreknew* that just such a number would be *lost*, before he created them? And yet he says, "All *may* be saved," when God foresaw that a definite number would be lost! O consistency, thou art a jewel! But he says, "Christ told his disciples distinctly, that if they died in their sins, whither he went, they never could come." In reply, I would say, there is no such

passage in all the Bible. In John 13: 33, Christ says to the little children, "As I said unto the *Jews*, so now I say unto you, whither I go ye cannot come." If this language proves the endless suffering of the Jews, it proves that also of the little children, for the same language is addressed to both.

But my brother says, "The works of nature teach that all who transgress her laws must suffer the penalty." Certainly, I should be the *last* to deny it. But let him prove that the penalty is endless misery. My Bible says, "In the day ye eat thereof ye *shall* die," not in the future world. Solomon says, "The righteous shall be *recompensed* (where?) in the earth." This agrees with nature's law, which makes the "burnt child dread the fire." Let my brother show, that for violating any law, man will *suffer* the *penalty* in the next world.

I will now ask your attention to my *sixth argument*, drawn from the *nature* and *design* of *punishment*.

When a person is *diseased*, the physician prescribes such medicine as he thinks will *restore* to health. Now the soul, morally diseased, requires more careful treatment than the body. The good Shepherd says, "The whole need not a physician, but they that are sick." Our position, then, is, punishment is one of the means to restore the sinner to soundness;—its design is good,—to produce reformation. But what good *would endless misery* do? The remedy is worse than the disease. Punishment, viewed in the light of a medicine, is *corrective*, and it is just as necessary for us to receive a *just* punishment for our sins, as for the sick man to take medicine; because it is for our good. The Bible fully sustains these views. In Deut. 8: 5, we read, "Thou shalt consider, that as a man chastens his son, *so* the Lord chastens thee." Why does a good parent punish his child? To produce obedience. So God punishes his offspring, for their good. Hence Solomon says, "My son, despise *not* the chastenings of the Lord, for whom the Lord loveth he chasteneth." How many does God love?

Jesus answers, "God so *loved* the *world*," &c. Then because he loves all, he punishes all. *What for?* Paul answers, "*For our profit*, that we may be partakers of his holiness." But would it be for our profit to punish us eternally? No, it would defeat the very object of punishment, and place us beyond the pale of reformation. Hence Paul says, in Heb. 12: 11, "Now no chastening, for the present, seemeth to be joyous, but grievous; nevertheless, *afterward* it yieldeth the peaceable fruits of righteousness." If punishment is endless, how can *there* be an AFTERWARD to it? So, we see, punishment is designed for our benefit, and is one of the means employed to secure the salvation of the sinner.

My seventh argument, in support of our views, I build upon the *attributes of Deity*. God is infinite in love, goodness, mercy, wisdom, and power. Now, what *motive* could a being of this character have in creating the human family? Answer. To make them forever happy. Dr. Clarke says, "He made *none* for perdition." Then he made all for salvation. Then, if it was God's desire to *save* all, would he have *created* a single soul, knowing it must be endlessly miserable? Suppose I desire for my children a *long* and happy life, is it reasonable to believe that I would place in their possession a pistol, loaded with buckshot, with which I *knew* they would take their lives? This is precisely, we are told, what God has done. They tell us, he created all for salvation, — he purposed and *desires* the salvation of all. Well, how does he go to work to accomplish so desirable an object? Why, in the room of employing his wisdom to adopt a plan to accomplish his work, he throws obstacles in the way. Yes, he gives his creatures a "free agency," in the exercise of which, he foreknew they would *defeat* his purpose in their salvation. He designed the salvation of all; and yet, throws a stumbling-block in the way, over which, he FORESAW, millions would stumble into an endless hell. And this hell it is said, he prepared for them before

the foundation of the world. Although Clarke says, "*He made none for perdition*," but *desires* and *wills* the salvation of all, yet he intends to punish his offspring eternally. If my brother will show how endless torment will accomplish God's purpose, fulfil his design, gratify his desire, harmonize with his attributes, and satisfy the Saviour who died to save all, I will yield him the *palm* of victory. [*Time expired.*]

MR. TODD'S SECOND REPLY.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS: — My brother misunderstood me, in regard to the prayers of the world being on the side of our respective systems. I meant, in my remarks, to say, that the *wishes* of men, that he might be correct in his views, gave him no advantage over me; for I presume that he, at least, will agree with me in praying for the truth.

I will call his attention to the following passage in Paul's writings: "He that doubteth is damned." What, I would ask, does he mean by the word "damned," in this place? Perhaps he may say condemned. I ask, condemned to what? But let that pass.

My brother argues that Christ cannot have died in vain. Now, I think, I have proved that his object was to place man on salvable ground; and he did. Here is the great point of difference between us: the nature of the atonement, or rather the effects of that great sacrifice.

He accuses me of quoting Scripture incorrectly. I was not aware of doing so; if I do so, it will not be intentionally, and I will thank him to correct me at once. I said salvation was free for all, — the glorious promises of the Gospel may be partaken of by all; but all have conditions attached to them.

I wish to call the attention of my brother to another passage. In John 3: 3, we read, "Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God." How

will he dispose of this text? Will he say that the kingdom of God refers to the Gospel kingdom, which Christ established on the earth? Very well. Except they are born again, how can they enter the kingdom on earth, or in the next world? Let him show how men can be fitted for heaven, after death.

I am willing to admit that God is a being of infinite love and goodness. It is shown in all his works, — above and below, — in the harmonious arrangement of the orbs which surround us, in the many glorious powers he has given us, and, especially, in the gift of his son, to suffer and die, to provide a way of redemption for us. The mercy and goodness of God are taught upon almost every page of the revealed word. But while he is so profuse in the use of these passages, let me remind him that God is *just* as well as merciful. He says not a word about his justice. It is as important to preserve his justice as any other attribute of his holy character. Objectors seem to forget that not only his love, but also his justice, is infinite, and that the removal of either would destroy his character. Without justice there would be no love. Remember that God is a *God* of order; that the Almighty is governed by infinite and immutable laws; and that all his actions are controlled by them. Order is a predominant principle in all his works.

My brother has drawn the inference, from the foreknowledge of God, that all will be saved. But what an inconsistent argument! God does not possess foreknowledge, according to the common acceptation of the term. Time and space are unknown to Deity. With him it is *one* eternal *now*. We call his power foreknowledge, for want of a better term; but it is not the same as predestination. Much of our knowledge of the infinite holiness and wisdom of God is marred for the want of language to express his attributes. I wish to ask one question, particularly, on this point. If God knew, in the sense in which my brother has it, that mankind would *all* sin, how much did he

respect his own character in creating them? And when this is answered, I think I can prove to his satisfaction, that foreknowledge is not a determinate decree. God knew that man was governed by the same everlasting and infinite principles which govern himself. If he predetermined and knew that man would sin, and did not give him the power to resist temptation, then the responsibility is changed. God is the sinner, and the Bible is a useless and foolish book. Under these circumstances, if it is inconsistent to punish the sinner an hour, it is, also, to punish him eternally. If man is not to blame for breaking the moral law, he is not the physical law. And who is willing to suffer the pains of this life? If God decreed sin, man is not to blame.

My brother seems willing to give up all that is noble in man; he will give up man's free-agency for the sake of throwing the sin upon the Almighty, and getting the sinner into heaven unrepented. But it will not avail. God gave man free-agency in the garden of Eden, and if he had power to resist temptation one hour, he had a thousand years. — [*Time expired.*]

MR. LAKE'S THIRD SPEECH.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS: — I am surprised at some of the ideas advanced by my brother in his last reply, because, like nine-pins, they knock each other down, and remind me of the sign, "*All kinds of twisting and turning done here.*" For instance: He asks, "if God created man with the foreknowledge that he would sin, what respect had he for his own character?" And yet, he argues in the *same* speech, that with God there is no *past*, nor *future*, but *all* ONE *eternal now!* According to this, there were countless millions in hell, even before he created them, as there is nothing *new* nor *old* to God, but all past and future is one *eternal now* with God. What honor does this view

reflect upon Deity, to create a world under such circumstances? This is worse than predestination. How much more consistent is Paul's view of this matter! He says, "The creature was made *subject* to *vanity*." What for? That God might have an opportunity to punish forever? No. "For the whole creation shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption, into the glorious liberty of the children of God." But according to every limitarian creed in the land, God has created man totally *depraved*. Yes, they tell us he is made averse to all goodness, — inclined to all evil, — he cannot *think* one good thought, nor perform one acceptable deed, and God intends to punish him eternally for doing just what he was made to do. You might as well exhort a lion to become a lamb, as to exhort a totally depraved being to repent. But my brother says, man is a "free agent, and can resist temptation." How so, if he is born totally depraved? How is man an accountable being, if it is his nature to sin, any more than the fish that swims in water? Let my brother show that man has an agency by which he can defeat the purpose of God — that man is so free he can believe two and two make six — that he can *hate* that which is lovely, or *love* that which is hateful — that he can fly with wings — and I will take the counterpart and show that man is a creature of circumstances, and, frequently, cannot do what he wishes to!

My brother asks the meaning of the passage, "He that doubteth *is* damned." The Saviour tells us *what* and where this condemnation is, in John 3: 18, 19. "He that believeth *not* is condemned ALREADY. And *this* is the condemnation, (not endless suffering,) light is come into the world, and men choose darkness rather than light." If a person shuts his eyes to the sun, is not this punishment enough while he remains in this condition? Or must you put out his eyes, so that he can never behold the Sun of righteousness?

Sorry I am, that my brother should so grossly misrepresent our views, by representing us as robbing

man of all that is noble, for the sake of getting the sinner into heaven unrepented. We believe that heaven is a holy and spotless place, and that the self-styled saints will experience a greater change than we have seen in them yet, before *they* will walk the golden streets. This change all will experience, for in the resurrection, Jesus told the Sadducees, "they will be made equal to the angels." Neither do we believe that men will enter heaven without being born again. In my scriptural argument, I shall quote more "profusely" the precious promises which look *forward* to a time, when ALL shall *know* the Lord, from the least to the greatest, "whom to know is life eternal."

My brother says, "I have forgotten that God is a being of justice." I thank my brother for reminding me of it; for, from the *justice* of Deity, I shall *draw* one of the *strongest* arguments in favor of the final salvation of all men. What, then, does justice require? It *demands* that all love God. Universal obedience being due to God, it will not be satisfied with anything short of the salvation of all. Now, as justice requires that all men love and obey God, how can it be satisfied by endless rebellion? Will the claims of justice ever be satisfied? Jesus answers: "Not one jot or tittle of the law shall fail, till *all* be fulfilled." Now, justice will see that this law of love be fulfilled by all upon whom it is binding.

Again, justice requires that men be punished for their sins, and rewarded for their virtues. Now, if it takes one eternity to punish man for his *bad* deeds, it will take another, on the same principle, to reward him for his good deeds. And, as eternity has no end, when can it be said "the sinner has received his just punishment?" Why, after the sinner has been in hell as many years as there are sands upon the sea-shore, or stars in the heavens, he is no nearer getting his punishment or his reward. How, then, can justice ever be satisfied? Let my brother *show*, if he can, that there is any justice in punishing a *finite*

being endlessly, for the sins of this life. Let him show that there is any justice in punishing all sinners of all grades — from the little girl that has committed but one sin, to the pirate — with the same duration of punishment. Let him also show that justice sanctions the sending of such men as Thomas Jefferson, John Adams, and Benj. Franklin, to an endless hell, merely because they did not believe in orthodoxy; while, at the same time, justice opens heaven to the most *hardened villains*, if they will but repent. And, finally, let him show that it is doing as God would be done by, to create, of the dust, a human being, whose existence God foreknew would prove an endless curse. Thus, we see, that justice is as much *opposed* to endless punishment as love, goodness, or mercy.

But my brother says, "It is as consistent for God to punish eternally, as for an hour." Has my brother answered my argument on the *design* of punishment, which I showed to be for the good of the subject? According to his reasoning, we might say, "If it is consistent with the love of God for him to be sick a day, it is all his lifetime."

Let me now introduce my *eighth argument*, drawn from the *desire* and *pleasure* of God.

God *desires* the *salvation* of *all.* This all admit, except here and there an old-fashioned Calvinist. In Job 23: 13, we read, "He is one mind, and none can *turn* him, and *whatsoever* his soul *desireth, that* he *doeth.*" The argument is conclusive. His *desire* shall be granted. It is God's *pleasure* to save all. In Isa. 55: 10, we read, "My council shall *stand,* and I will do *all my pleasure.*" (Col. 1: 19.) This argument also establishes the affirmative of the question.

My ninth argument rests on the *will* and *purpose* of God.

Paul exhorts that we pray for all, for "God *will* have all men to be saved." (1 Tim. 2: 1, 2.) It has been admitted that it is God's *declarative* will to save

all, but he has a *secret will* which is opposed to the salvation of all. If he has two *wills*, one of which is *secret*, how came our opponents to be in possession of the SECRET? And if it is a secret will, how came they to know anything about it? Let us hear Paul: "Having made *known* unto *us* the mystery of HIS WILL, which he hath purposed in himself, that, in the dispensation of the fulness of times, he might gather together, in one, *all* things in Christ." (Eph. 1: 9—10.) But it is God's *purpose* to save all. Hear the beloved John: "We have seen, and do testify, that the Father sent the Son to be the Saviour of the world." God says, through the prophet Isaiah, "As I have *purposed*, so shall it *come* to pass." Again, (see Jer. 51: 29,) "Every purpose of the Lord shall be performed." It is God's *desire*, PLEASURE, WILL, and PURPOSE, to *save all* mankind, and, being *infinite* in power, he will do all his *pleasure* in heaven and in earth. [*Time expired.*]

MR. TODD'S THIRD REPLY.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS: — My brother answered much as I anticipated, in regard to the condemnation. But, if the sinner is not exposed to suffering after death, why should the angels "rejoice more over one that repents, than over ninety and nine that need no repentance?"

This idea my brother seems to forget, that the Almighty moves according to the laws of order. I hold that the will of man, so far as it is delegated to man, is as powerful as the will of God. God *cannot* save man *against* his will, although my brother flatters himself that he not only can save, but will. God has devised a way of salvation, — he has sent his Son to be a Saviour to those who accept of his terms, and those who do not must be forever lost.

I am glad that my brother admits justice to be an attribute of the Deity. This is an important point.

At this stage of our debate, I wish to ask leave of my brother to answer the question, "how is it *consistent with God's love to punish his children endlessly?*"

Mr. Lake. — O, yes. Proceed.

Mr. Todd. — *All* God's laws, it must be remembered, are eternal. He makes *none* for the time-being — he makes no temporary arrangements. He has placed man on this earth, as a probationer for eternity. Now, *if* eternal life is a *reward* for keeping the law, is it not just that *eternal* death should be the penalty for violating the law?

My brother says, that punishment should be proportioned to the sins we commit, and that nothing demands the endless punishment of the transgressor. I answer, God's own character *demands* it. Angels and saints *demand* it; — God's own infinite laws *demand* it.

Did we possess equality with God, it would be right to talk of doing as we would be done by. My brother has much to say of God's mercy and love; and I grant all he claims in these respects for God; but how is his justice to be satisfied? Christ atoned for Adam's sin, but we have to atone for our sins, or repent. If we are not under grace, we are still under the law, and the penalty of the law is death.

Suppose a case. Here is a man sinning every day. He loathes goodness and good men. He dies, and is taken into heaven — into the company of the blest. Let me tell you he will suffer as much *there*, as the angels of light placed among the *damned*. The saints of light are more unpleasant company for the sinner, than are those of his own character.

Again, my brother tells us that the punishment of our first parents was limited. I wish he would tell us what would have been their punishment if Christ had not died! How many ages — how many cycles of eternity would have rolled away? I say the punishment of our first parents was *unlimited*, but God provided a Saviour, that those who believe might have eternal life.

Let not my brother mistake, because I say that Christ died to do away with Adam's sin. We have all sinned, and are in the same position that Adam was. A somewhat similar case is that of a criminal who has committed an offence against human laws, and is sentenced to die, but whose sentence is commuted to imprisonment for life. He has no claim to the privileges of freedom. So the sinner against God's laws has lost all claim to his regard. The commission of *but* one sin throws him into this position. "If he turn away from his righteousness, it shall be mentioned. And in his trespasses and in his sins shall he die." [*Time expired.*]

MR. LAKE'S FOURTH SPEECH.

Respected Moderators: — Allow me to call the attention of this attentive audience, to some remarks of my brother in his last reply. He says, "The will of man is as powerful as the *will* of God." Your good sense will tell you better — for *man* is finite — God, *almighty* and infinite. He says, "God *cannot save* man *against* his *will*." Then if God has *not power* to *save* him, he has not power to *damn* him. And the sinner may stand up and say to God, "I defeated your purpose in your *attempt* to save me, and I can *now* defeat *your purpose* in your attempt to damn me!!!" As to saving men against their will, we believe with David: "My people shall be *willing* in the day of my power." My brother makes a futile attempt to show it is consistent with God's character to punish eternally. Well, how does he do it? Why, he says, "All God's laws are eternal." But were the laws *made* for the Jews eternal? did they not have a beginning? Did not Christ abolish these laws? How, then, are they eternal? Does not God say, "I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel; I will put my laws in their minds, and write them upon their hearts, and they shall not

teach every man his brother, saying, Know the Lord, for all *shall* KNOW me, from the LEAST to the GREATEST." (Heb. 8: 9, 10.) Does this look like punishing men eternally? It does not follow, because God is the author of a law, that it is eternal; for he is the maker of the worm, and all transitory things. So, the premises of my brother being false, of course the inference is. My brother says, we are probationers, placed here to form characters for eternity. Well! what kind of characters do the *heathen* form?—what kind of characters do *idiots* and insane persons form for eternity? We may well ask what kind of *characters* do the self-styled *saints* and ministers form, for heaven? Not very good, *if* we can judge them by their fruits, according to late accounts.

My brother says, "*If eternal* life is the reward for keeping the law, then eternal *death* is the penalty for violating it." Ah! *that* IF is right in the way, and opens a wide door. *If* eternal life is the REWARD; but Paul says, "ETERNAL *life* is the *gift* of God; *not* of *works*, lest any man should boast." He says again, "By grace ye are saved, and that *not* of yourselves!" What *now* becomes of his argument? IF eternal life is the reward for keeping the law, then endless death is true. What! then God is in debt to man. Blessed Jesus! has it come to this, that man is *entitled* to eternal life on the ground of a reward? What! no merit in thy sufferings? in thy rich blood, poured forth like water, to wash away the sins of the world? What! man *entitled* to eternal life as a reward for his good works? Ungrateful mortal! you can't pay God five *per cent.* for the blessings of this life.

As eternal life is not the reward for our good works, so eternal death is not the punishment for sin. Hence, the expression, eternal death, is not found once in the Bible. Paul says, "Death, the last enemy, shall be destroyed." John says, "There shall be no more death." How satisfactory this!

My brother says, "God demands the endless punishment of the sinner;—angels and saints demand

it." This is the *wildest* remark my brother has made since we commenced the discussion. Only look at it,—God *demands* the *endless suffering* of his own offspring! What kind of a Father must he be, to create millions in his own image, and then *demand* that they be miserable to all eternity? What! demand the endless torment of those whom he sent his *Son* to save? What! demand their eternal punishment, and yet Jesus says, "God so loved the world, that he sent *not* his SON to *condemn* the world, but that the world, through him, might be saved." If he demands the endless punishment of the sinner, why did he *not* send his Son to *execute* that demand?

But he says, "Angels demand that the sinner be punished eternally;" and yet Jesus says, "There is more joy in heaven among the angels over one that repents than ninety-nine that need no repentance." My brother says, too, that saints demand the endless punishment of the sinner, and *yet they pray* for the salvation of *all*. And Solomon says, "The desire of the righteous *shall* be granted." How can they pray for the salvation of all, and yet *demand* endless punishment for a part of the human race? Well, if God demands the endless punishment of the sinner, of course Christ does, for they *are one;* and yet "Christ came to seek and to save the lost." They have a singular way of *executing* their *demand*. My brother admits that God is a being of love and goodness, "but his *justice* must be satisfied," if his mercy *is not*. Are God's attributes at variance? Justice will not be satisfied with anything short of the salvation of all for whom Jesus died. Justice *is not* REVENGE, nor does it sanction the rendering of an *endless evil* for the evil of this life. But Justice has two eyes; it looks to the good of the offender, and requires that every man be punished for his *bad*, and *rewarded* for his good, deeds. But if it takes an eternity to punish a man for his sins, it will take another to *reward* his virtues. And thus justice would never be satisfied if endless misery is true. Besides, justice requires that men be punished *for their good*.

My brother supposes a sinner in *heaven*, and says, "He would be more miserable *there* than in hell." But *this is not* a supposable case, unless we suppose there was *once* war in heaven, and, according to Milton, they were very *unwilling* to be thrust out of heaven. But, "if there is no change after death," how can the self-styled saints be happy in heaven any more than the sinner? — for there is more contention and quarrelling among the sects than among the world's people. There are two professed Christian ministers in my place of residence, who will hardly speak to each other, much *less* exchange pulpit services. How will you reconcile them, and fit *little* sinners for heaven? For if there are to be as many sects in heaven, and as much fighting there as here, heaven will be a curious place. This reminds me of a dream which an aged lady told her minister. She told him, she dreamed she died, and went to heaven, and saw *all* denominations there, — the *close communion* Baptists in one place by themselves, — but all were not *far* from the Saviour, except one denomination. This denomination, she noticed, seemed to be enjoying freedom, and in possession of the most perfect enjoyment. She said, "I asked the Saviour, what people are they on that elevated plain, that seem to be so happy? 'Why,' said he, 'they are the *Universalists*, and they are the only HONEST people I can TRUST out of my *sight*.'" This appears evident, when the believers in endless woe are frequently heard to say, "*if it were not for the fear of hell, they would take their fill of sin.*"

My brother says, "The punishment of our first parents was unlimited;" and yet the most learned divines, among whom the names of Campbell, Paley, Jahn, hold a conspicuous rank, admit, that future punishment is not taught in any of the five books of Moses, nor in any part of the Old Testament.

I now introduce my *tenth* argument, drawn from the *prayers of Christ*, for the salvation of all men. In our Lord's prayer, we are taught to say, "*Thy will be done.*" God wills the salvation of all; and if

this prayer is answered, his *will* must be done. On the cross Jesus prayed for the forgiveness of his enemies; if God hears his prayer, *they will be forgiven.* In John 17, Jesus says, "I pray that the *world* may *believe;*" and he that believeth shall be *saved.* Will *this* prayer be *answered?* See John 11: 42. "Father, I *thank* thee that *thou* hast heard me." Again, he says, "I *know* that thou *hearest* me *always.*" I am willing to rest the salvation of *all men* on this *one argument.* Jesus prayed for the salvation of all men, even for the forgiveness of his murderers; and it were equivalent to *blasphemy* to say his prayers will not be answered.

But we are commanded to pray in faith for the salvation of all. 1 Timothy 2: 8. "I will," says Paul, "that men pray everywhere, lifting up holy hands, without *wrath* and doubting." And yet how many there are who pray for the salvation of all, and yet *doubt* it! They pray for an *event* in which they have no faith — which they believe can never take place. So they have no FAITH in their prayers for the salvation of all. They *pray* one thing, and *preach* another. They *pray* that their sermons may be *false*, and preach that *their prayers* will never be answered! I never heard but one orthodox divine who prayed as he believed. He said, in the midst of a revival, "O Lord, we thank thee that there is a hell for the wicked!" This prayer was consistent with his belief, if *not* acceptable in the sight of God. Paul commands us to pray for *all men*, for kings, and for all who are in authority. For, he says, this is a good prayer; it is acceptable in the sight of God our Saviour, who will have all men to be saved, and come to the knowledge of the truth. See 1 Timothy 2: 1—8.

The righteous desire and pray for the salvation of all mankind. Dr. Clarke says, "God wills the salvation of all men, therefore, he wills that all men should be prayed for." In Proverbs 10: 24, we read, "The desire of the righteous shall be granted." The argument is complete; it establishes the final salvation of all, as sure as God hears prayers.

MR. TODD'S FOURTH REPLY.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS:—I wish to remind my brother that many of the arguments adduced by him have little or no reference to the subject under discussion. The question reads thus: "Is there sufficient evidence for believing in the final holiness and happiness of all mankind?" Bringing up ideas held years ago by distant persons, and refuting them, as he does, *ably* and totally, is not establishing his positions, nor destroying mine. I am here, as I took occasion to say at the commencement of the debate, to defend principles, not men; truth, and not creeds.

His principal argument is, "that *death* and *hell* are to be destroyed." But I cannot *see* a single argument to show that such is to be the fact. I do not believe that sin, or the cause of sin, will ever be destroyed. He speaks of a great change which all are to pass through in order to be fitted for heaven; but he does not intimate *where* or *when* this change takes place. I hold to such a change,—a change such as Christ explained to Nicodemus,—a being "born again," into the light and liberty of the gospel,—a change which makes old things pass away, and all things become new. But I hold it is in this life; that as we die, so we go to the judgment; that no change takes place in our character after death.

My brother thinks none but demons will pray for endless punishment; but it does not exceed my disposition *thus* to pray. I consider that the infinite character of God demands such a punishment.

But we are told the "pleasure of God" is a guarantee for the salvation of all. The pleasure of God cannot oppose nor overpower the pleasure and will of man in this respect. To do so would be for God to give power, and then take it away—to *grant* a free agency, and then forbid it. I have the same charge to bring against Brother Lake, which he brings against me, that he avoids and slides past my arguments.

Jehovah, and he alone, can appreciate the extent of

sin; therefore, only he can say how great a punishment is right and just. We must not judge the Almighty by our feelings. God, he tells us, desires and wills the salvation of all. What evidence have we of this? I see one of the strongest proofs in the fact that he has sent his Son to provide a way by which the lost race of man may find salvation. Brother Lake should take passages as they are connected together, and not pick out one here and there, and thus think to build up a strong superstructure.

MR. LAKE'S FIFTH SPEECH.

RESPECTED AUDITORS:—The gentleman who just sat down told you that my principal argument is "that death and hell are to be destroyed;" but he can *see* no evidence of the fact. Is my brother blind? Did I not quote from the prophet Hosea, "O HELL, I will be thy DESTRUCTION?" But there is another way to prove the destruction of hell. Clarke says, "Sin constitutes hell." Daniel says, "Jesus shall finish sin," destroy the devil with all his evil works. Where will be your hell when Jesus finishes sin? As to death, Paul says, "it is the *last enemy*, and shall be destroyed." Let this suffice.

He says, I have not "intimated where the change is to take place, which is to fit all men for heaven." He must acknowledge, if the time ever comes when sin shall be finished, and all shall know the Lord from the least to the greatest, there must be a great change. But he wants to *know when* and *where* this change takes place. Well, I will gratify his desire. Paul says, "In a *moment*, in the twinkling of an eye, at the sound of the trumpet, the dead shall be raised, and we shall be *changed*." "For as in Adam *all* die, *even* so in Christ shall all be made alive." The Methodist commentator, Clarke, saw this passage taught the salvation of all so plainly, that he did *not* offer one word of comment upon it. But Paul says, the change is from corruption to incorruption, from mortal to

immortality. Jesus told the Sadducees, "In the resurrection they neither marry nor are given in marriage, but are equal to the angels in heaven." Is not here a change? Is any man equal to an angel in this life? Now what will you think of my brother's statement, that there is no change in our characters after death? If there is not, then we shall have heathens, idiots, insane persons, and all grades of characters, in heaven. Thus I have shown that, in the resurrection, the same number that died in Adam shall be made alive in Christ, and Paul says, "If any man be in Christ he is a new creature; old things are passed away, and all things become new."

My brother asks, "What evidence have we that God *desires* and *wills* the salvation of all?" and then proceeds to *state*, the evidence that God desires the salvation of all *is seen* in the fact that he has sent his Son *not* to condemn the world, but that the world through him might be saved. I thank my dear brother for this suggestion, for it reminds me of my *eleventh argument*, drawn from the *mission* of *Christ to save the world.*

We learn this from the parable of the good shepherd. "Which of you, having a hundred sheep, and lose one of them, would not leave the ninety-nine, and seek after the lost one until you have found it? Likewise the Son of man is come to seek and to save the lost." Luke 19: 10. Again, our Lord says, "They who are whole need not a physician, but they who are sick." So Jesus did not come to save the righteous, but sinners. "This is a faithful saying," says Paul, "that Jesus came into the world to save sinners, of whom I am CHIEF;" and if the chief can be saved, the least can. Then it is a settled point, that Christ came to save all men. John says, "We have seen and do testify that the Father sent the Son to be the Saviour of the world." Now is Christ able to save all men? If he is *not* able to save the world, and cannot save only half of it, why did God send him to accomplish a work, which God *knew would not be done?*

But Christ will COMPLETE the *work* he undertook. He says, "Which of you, intending to build a house, would not sit down FIRST and count the cost, lest, after you commence, those who behold it, begin to MOCK, saying, This man commenced to build, but he was not able to *finish*." Is Jesus like unto this man? Did he not count the cost? Did he lay the foundation for the salvation of all, and yet is not able to finish the work? According to the doctrine of endless misery, Christ did *not count* the cost, and so he will not, *nor* cannot, do what he came to do. He came to *destroy* the *devil*, and to save all men; but my brother thinks he will do *neither*. The devil will come off conqueror, with more than half under his dominion, for whom Christ died. Who can believe this?

> "He 'll finish sin, and man restore;
> All creatures shall their God adore;
> The anthem long and loud shall swell,
> For Jesus hath done all things well."

I call your attention to my twelfth argument, which rests on the *fact* that God has given *all* men to Christ, for a *specific* purpose, viz., to deliver them from the bondage of corruption, and to fit and prepare them for heaven. "For to this end Christ both died and rose again, that he might be Lord (owner) both of the dead and the living." Romans 14: 7, 8. Jesus then is Lord of *all*. Peter did not learn this until he saw the heavens opened, and a vessel containing all manner of creatures descend to earth, and return to heaven three times. He says, "All were drawn up into heaven." Then he opened his eyes, (as I wish my brother might open his,) and said, "Jesus is Lord of all." Acts 10: 36.

> "All hail the power of Jesus' name,
> Let angels prostrate fall,
> Bring forth the royal diadem,
> And crown him *Lord of all*."

Now, if any are finally *lost*, who will be the *greatest*

loser? God, the original proprietor. Would God have given all mankind, even the heathen, to Christ, if he had foreseen that he would allow the devil to rob him of countless millions? No, no. Hence, Jesus says, "The Father loveth the Son, and hath given all things into his hands." Paul calls him the "*heir* of all things." How will Christ dispose of all men, whom the Father has given him? See John 6: 37. "All that the Father hath given to me shall come to me." "Yes," says the objector, "they will all come to him in the judgment." But you forget the last clause of the verse: "And *he that cometh* to me I will in no *wise cast out*." And if Jesus will not cast them out, would you? This drives the nail and clinches it! The argument is irrefutable. On another occasion, our Lord said, "As *thou* hast given him *power over all flesh*, that he should give eternal life to as many as thou hast given him." John 17: 2. "For I came not down from heaven to do mine own will, but the will of Him who sent me; and this is the Father's will, that of all he hath given me, I *should lose nothing*." John 6: 38. Jesus will lose none. Like the good shepherd, he will not give up his work until the *last* wanderer is brought home. Unlike the hireling that fleeth when the wolf cometh, Jesus will protect his flock, which Dr. Clarke says, "are all mankind," and *conduct* them into *luxuriant* pastures, *beside waters of salvation*; "*And there shall be one fold and one shepherd.*" John 10: 16.

"As music fills the grove,
When stormy clouds are past,
Sweet anthems of redeeming love
Shall all employ at last."

MR. TODD'S FIFTH REPLY.

MESSRS. MODERATORS: — Brother Lake commenced his last with a slight mistake. He *misunderstood* me. I did not charge him with accusing me of believing

the old exploded notions, such as election and reprobation, but of answering and refuting them, instead of overturning my positions.

My brother says, there is to be a great change wrought. I have not said there would be no change; but *no* spiritual change. I admit there will be a change in all of us. I believe that all those who are to be finally holy, experience a great change on the earth. But they are far from being holy here. Their minds are encumbered with a mortal body; they are surrounded by evil in various forms; but when admitted into the future world, their spirits will be freed from the fetters of earth, and they will be permitted to soar aloft with all their native strength. I agree with him that God governs the same in the future world as in this; but do not draw the same conclusion from it, viz., that an opportunity will be given men to repent there.

My brother tells us that "death and hell are to be destroyed;" but he supports this by very feeble arguments. The Holy Word positively informs us, that "Whosoever is not found in the Lamb's Book of Life, will be cast into the lake of fire."

He says, God has given all mankind to Christ, and that he will save them; but, I again remind him of the conditions. I leave to the audience, which side they see fit to believe on all these points. I hold that Christ has died for Adam's sin, which has fallen on all mankind; but he is especially the Saviour of all that believe in him.

"But how," asks my brother, "is he the Saviour of any?"

I answer, — he is the righteousness of those that believe, because Christ's righteousness is imputed to them. Here is the inconsistency of my brother's position.

My brother quotes from John: "All that the Father hath given to Christ shall come to him, and he will not cast them out." But it should be remembered, that he told the Jews, "Ye will not come unto me

that ye might have life." There is a point beyond which they cannot pass, — a point where mercy will not reach them. The Spirit of God will not always strive with men.

He says, God will give a day of mercy there; but I must differ from him here. I see no proof of this, either from the revealed word, or from the works of nature. It is in the judgment world that the door of mercy will be closed. "Depart from me, ye workers of iniquity," is a text familiar to all, and it refers to after death, to a terrible day when Christ shall judge the world in righteousness.

MR. LAKE'S SIXTH SPEECH.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS: — I must confess my surprise that my brother should so far depart from the question, as to introduce certain irrelevant passages, for the purpose, it would seem, to forestall public opinion. I have introduced many arguments, and quoted many passages, to show that the time will come when sin shall be finished, death and hell destroyed, and all know the Lord from the least to the greatest. Has he answered these arguments? Has he come within hailing distance of the question? In the room of quoting certain *threatenings*, (assuming that they mean endless woe,) which Paul says are not against the promises, and do not, as we shall show to-morrow, refer to the future state, why does he not attend to my arguments? Why does he not take up the context, and show, if he can, that I have misapplied these passages, which teach, every knee shall bow, every tongue shall confess that in the Lord they have strength and righteousness? It must be acknowledged that my good brother has signally failed to refute my arguments.

He says, Christ told the Jews "that they would not come unto him that they might have life." Does this prove the Saviour uttered a falsehood, when he

said, "If I be lifted up from earth, I WILL DRAW ALL men unto me?" John 12: 32. Does it follow, by any rule of interpretation, that because the Jews would not come to Christ in this life, they never *shall* come unto him? If so, it not only makes Christ, but Paul, utter a falsehood. For Paul says, "When the fulness of the Gentiles come in, *all* Israel shall be saved. For God hath CONCLUDED them all in unbelief." What for? To make them endlessly miserable? No; but "that he might have mercy upon all." See the whole of the 11th of Romans.

But my brother says, "There is a point where the mercy of God can *never* reach them," that is, in hell. But his anger can *reach* them FAST ENOUGH, and *that* to *all eternity*. How differently the inspired penman reasons! Isaiah says, "His anger *endureth* for a *moment;* but his mercy is from everlasting to everlasting." My brother has it the reverse of this. He says, "His mercy endures for a moment, and closes at death, while his anger endures through eternity." Again, in Isaiah 57: 16, we read, "I will *not contend forever*, neither will I always be wroth, (why?) for the spirit would fail before, and the souls which I have made." Orthodox ministers say, "The spirit can STAND endless punishment." God says, it CANNOT. Which shall be believed? In Lam. 3: 31, God says, "He will *not cast* off *forever*." The advocates of an eternal hell, say he will *cast* off forever. The Prophet Micah says, "He retaineth not *his* anger," and gives as a reason, "because he DELIGHTETH in mercy." Precious assurance! But my brother would have you believe that the door of mercy will be closed at death; when Paul assures us, "that where sin abounded, grace did *much* more abound." Where did Brother Todd learn his theology?

My brother says, "The righteous here are cumbered with a mortal body, surrounded by temptations, and are *far* from being holy here." I fully agree with him in this matter. And the same process by which he will fit little sinners for heaven, will fit great ones;

for God is no respecter of persons. What he says of the righteous leaving behind a body of corruption, and their spirits being free from all temptations to sin, I say of all mankind Free from sin, they will forever increase in virtue and knowledge. For Paul says, "As in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive."

I will now introduce my *thirteenth* argument, which rests on the meaning of the word gospel, and the nature of Charity. Dr. Adam Clarke says, "An angel was first sent to announce the gospel." And how did he do it? Listen. "Behold, I bring you good tidings of great joy, which shall be unto all people!" Luke 2:10. This is the gospel, the meaning of which is good news. Now, would *annihilation* be good tidings? No. Then, if annihilating the entire race would not be good news, of course raising mankind from the dead, on purpose to torment them through eternity, would not be good tidings, as *annihilation* would be far preferable to endless suffering. The inference is, that nothing short of a world's salvation, through Jesus Christ, constitutes the gospel. This *alone* is good tidings of great joy, which shall be unto all people. This agrees with Paul's definition of faith, which he says, "is the substance of things *hoped* for." Hebrews 11 : 1. No person can hope for the truth of atheism, or endless misery, but all hope and pray for the truth of Universalism; therefore, it is the apostolic faith, because "it is the substance of things hoped for."

But I pass to the meaning of "*Charity*." It is *love* in the original. It "rejoiceth *not* in iniquity, *but in the truth*." 1 Cor. 13:6. Now, if endless *sin* and misery is *truth*, can charity rejoice in it? No. For charity rejoiceth *not* in *iniquity*, but in the truth. Hence endless misery is not truth. But Paul says again, "Love worketh *no* ill to his neighbor." How, then, can God, who is love, inflict an endless *evil* upon his offspring? Impossible.

I now pass to my *fourteenth* argument, drawn from the "*precepts* of *Christianity*."

We are commanded to render good for evil, blessing for cursing, to overcome evil with good, that we may be LIKE God. Now, if God himself violates these rules, by *rendering* an endless evil for evil here; if he overcomes evil by perpetuating a greater one; if he acts upon revenge, how are we resembling him, when we render *good* for evil? Can the question be answered? We conclude, then, God would not command us to be better than he is; and as he has forbidden us to *retaliate*, but to render good for evil, he acts upon the same celestial principles, and will overcome *all* evil with good. The argument is irrefutable, and proves the salvation of all men.

My *fifteenth* argument rests upon the fact that God has given *eternal life* to all mankind. John says, "This is the *record*, that God hath given us eternal life." "What," says Paul, "if some will not believe; shall their unbelief make the truth of God of none *effect?* God forbid." From this we learn, that all are *heirs* of *eternal life;* that this is the gift of God, and that *what constitutes* a believer, is one who credits *this truth;* and what makes an *unbeliever*, is one who disbelieves that he is an heir of eternal life. We cannot better show the force of this, than by the following illustration: "A father dies, and *wills* his six minor children, living in Europe, *all his property*, amounting to twelve thousand dollars. An executor is appointed, who announces to them the fact. *Three* of them believe the executor, and look forward to the time, when they shall come in possession of their portions of said property. The other three do *not believe* that they are heirs to their father's property. Does *their unbelief* destroy their *title* to their portion of the estate?" Hence, we see the reason why unbelievers are called upon to *believe* that God has given them *eternal life;* it is RESERVED for them in heaven, and by believing that they are heirs to an inheritance incorruptible, they enjoy the *interest* of it here, enjoy

a foretaste of heaven, and *enter* into rest. Their *unbelief* of this truth prevents them enjoying the present salvation, which a belief in the gospel affords. And when all mankind can

> "Read their title clear
> To *mansions* in the skies,"

they will bless God for bestowing upon them eternal life, through Jesus Christ our Lord.

Before dismissing this argument, I wish to ask, if all mankind are not heirs of eternal life, why should they be called upon to believe that they are? What constitutes an *unbeliever*, if not one who disbelieves that Christ is his Saviour? I know we are told that Christ never was, nor never will be, the Saviour of any unbeliever, although he is called, in the Bible, the Saviour of the world. If Christ is *not* the Saviour of *unbelievers*, then why call upon them to believe? What! call upon them to believe that Christ is *their* Saviour, if he is not? It was this argument that led Mr. Murray to be a Universalist. In company with two or three friends, he went to reclaim a young lady, who had embraced the "restitution of all things." The following is the substance of their conversation: —

Said Mr. Murray, "*He that believes shall be saved.*" "*Believes what?*" "In Christ." "As my Saviour?" "No, he is *not* your Saviour until you believe." "But what shall I believe? If I should believe in Christ as my Saviour, when he is not, I should believe a lie." So the advocates of eternal woe present no truth for the unbeliever to believe. They say they must believe in endless misery, or be lost. Now suppose all were to believe in endless misery, then they would all be saved by believing a lie, because there would be none to suffer endless misery; consequently, they are called upon to believe a *lie*, in order to be saved.

MR. TODD'S SIXTH REPLY.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS: — Brother Lake accuses me of begging the question, by quoting certain passages, and taking it for granted that they refer to the future state. Really, if any one is to blame, it is Brother Lake. He has culled quotations from all parts of the Bible, to explain each other, when no relation at all exists between the passages. As if he should read, "Judas went out and hanged himself," and then, turning to another, "*Go thou and do likewise.*"

My brother thinks all will be saved in Christ, whether they be willing or not. There is a mystery here, which he does not seem to be willing to explain. How does he make it consistent with the passage, "Ye will not come unto me that ye might have life." If God is to save all, why are they not redeemed from *sin* now, unless there is something elevating in sin? I understood him, this forenoon, to say, "that if it were not for sin, we should not know the worth of virtue, the same as sickness makes us value health." He says, "If it were not for sin, we never could sing the song, unto him that has loved us, and *washed* away our sins in his own blood." True; but I hold, that if the Almighty could make it consistent with his character to save all from the effects of sin, it would be much easier, and far more reasonable, to expect he would do so at once; or, rather, what would be still more desirable, would prevent their sinning in the first instance.

My brother steals off from my questions, so that I know hardly where to find him. He speaks of progress, &c. I believe, with him, that we shall go on increasing in knowledge. But, remember, man is a man in regard to his interior. If he lives here a sinner, he enters the future and eternal state a sinner. This, Brother Lake admits, but hopes to have him reformed afterwards. The unregenerate soul becomes an angel in *power*, and in knowledge, but not an angel

in purity. Will my brother argue that a spirit will not sin, and sin deeply, when endowed with such *great power*, and at the same time rebellious, disobedient, and malicious? How inconsistent!

I know no kind of angels but spiritual beings, yet there are angels of light, and angels of darkness. My brother seems to argue, that getting clear of this body will purify the spirit; but I do not see any grounds for such an inference. This body of mine never sinned, — it is the spirit; and just in the same state as the spirit leaves this world, it will enter the next. We live right on. The spiritual man never ceases to exist. It moves on in the same path as it moved in this world. There is no change in the moral character.

My brother lays great stress on the familiar passage, "As in Adam all die, *even so* in Christ shall all be made alive." The Apostle says, "*even so*," and I say "*even so*." The Apostle was speaking of the resurrection. He says, in the verse following, "Every man in his order, Christ the first fruits," &c.

Again, my brother says, "Reason teaches the final salvation of all." I know not why any should draw such an inference. Certainly, I could not see in his arguments anything like reason. Again, he speaks of the "restitution of all things." I think this means the restoration of order. We know that sin has introduced disorder in the otherwise harmonious arrangements of the universe. The promises mean that all things will be restored to their proper places, that the spirits of the righteous and the wicked will be in their proper places.

My brother argues, from the meaning of the word *gospel* and *charity*, that all will be restored to happiness. He thinks it is *not* good tidings that any should suffer eternally, even if others be glorified. He thinks that annihilation is preferable to endless misery. But is it so? The mind *instinctively* recoils at the thought of annihilation. There is great dread even of ceasing to exist in the present state, not so much from the pains of dying, but from a natural desire to live. And

if there is such a dread of death for this reason, how much is there a dread of annihilation! Doubtless, the news of a heaven or a hell, to the Sadducees, would be none other than good tidings; and it is very plain, that to those Jews, who believed in a hell, who were conscious that they had transgressed the law, and made themselves liable to the penalty, to such the tidings of a Saviour were most cheerful tidings, — a most glorious gospel. I think it is glad tidings to know, at any time, and under any circumstances, that God reigns, and will reign. The subject may seem a little difficult, but when we view it in the light of eternity, we shall see it as it is. Our frail body cumbers us now, but when this mortal shall put on immortality, we shall behold the infinite character of God, and of his laws, in their true light.

MR. LAKE'S SEVENTH SPEECH.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS: — My brother says, "I think that annihilation is preferable to endless suffering." I *do;* and nine tenths of the human family would prefer the peaceful sleep of the grave, to an eternity of misery. Dr. Edwards says, "The lost in hell will pray to be converted into the meanest reptile; their pains will be so great, they will beg God to blot them out of existence." Who has not seen persons, wasting away upon a sick bed, long for death to relieve them of their sufferings? But what are the pains of this life, compared to endless suffering, with no prospect of relief? The poor soul, whose existence God foresaw would prove an endless curse, may well cry out, in the touching language of Dr. Young,

> "Father of mercies, why from silent earth
> Didst *thou* awake and *curse* me into birth,
> * * * * * *
> Push into being a reverse of thee,
> And animate a clod with misery?"

If the gospel teaches endless misery, for any portion of mankind, how can it be good tidings of great joy,

which shall be unto all people? God foreknew WHO and WHAT NUMBER will be endlessly miserable, and, living or dying, who can *rejoice* in such a belief?

My brother asks, "If God is to save all, why does he not save all men now?" Paul answers, "For God hath concluded them all in unbelief, that he might have mercy upon all." Rom. 11: 32. Again, in Rom. 8: 21, we read, "The creature was made subject to vanity, because the creature itself shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption, into the glorious liberty of the children of God." Does the fact, that the whole creation is *made* subject to vanity, prove that God *will not*, as he has purposed, deliver it from the bondage of corruption?

My brother says, "His body does not sin, but his spirit." Well, if his spirit sins, it may sin to all eternity. But Paul says, in Rom. 8: 3, that "Jesus appeared in the likeness of *sinful flesh*, and for *sin*, condemned sin in the flesh." We never read of sinful spirit in the Bible. Will you punish the spirit *eternally* for what the flesh did? Again, Paul says, in Rom. 6: 7, "He that is dead is freed from sin." Again, in Gal. 5: 19, we read, "Now the WORKS of the flesh are manifest, viz., adultery, fornication, uncleanness, drunkenness, gluttony," &c. Now let my brother prove that the spirit will commit these vices in the next world, if he can. And then he will contradict Paul, who says, "that *sin* hath reigned unto death," its stopping-place. Once more, in Gal. 6: 8, we read, "He that soweth to his flesh, shall of the flesh reap corruption." My brother would have you believe that what we sow of the flesh, we shall reap of the spirit hereafter; about as consistent as to suppose a man who sows a field of wheat here, will go to California to reap it!

My brother says, "He knows of no kind of angels but spiritual ones," and yet proceeds to state that there *are angels of darkness!* How he keeps *contradicting* himself!

My brother says, "As men leave this world, so

they will enter the next," with their same characters. Then the *heathen* will be heathenish through eternity; *idiots* will remain so, and *maniacs* will be crazy throughout a boundless eternity! — for, he says, they move on in the same path they did in this life. Mr. Spear, in his work on the Titles of Jesus, mentions a Mr. Cogswell, an aged divine, whose memory was so impaired, that he forgot, when he died, the names of things which he held most dear. According to my brother, as he left this world almost a *perfect fool*, so he will enter the next, and remain so through eternity, although he was once a very learned man. Wonderful reasoning! Besides, he says, they will go on increasing in sin, although they were TOTALLY *depraved when* they were born; yet they will keep growing worse and worse. Eternity will be a *fine school*, according to this.

My brother says, the passage, "As in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive," refers to the resurrection. So let it be. We agree here. But you will remember, Paul says, "If any man be in Christ he is a *new* creature," and there is no condemnation to such as are in Christ. So if ALL are made *alive in* Christ, in the resurrection, what will hinder the final holiness and happiness of all mankind? Paul *was* a *Universalist;* and if you will read the 15th of the first of Corinthians, you will see that he is teaching the future blessedness of every son and daughter of Adam.

Let me now introduce my sixteenth argument, in support of the salvation of all men. It is drawn from the fact, that the *resurrection* of all men is *set* forth as a *matter* of *hope*, and a *source* of *consolation*. Paul, in his *defence* before King Agrippa, said, "*He had hope* for the resurrection of all, even the *unjust*." Could he *hope* that the unjust might be raised, if he believed they would suffer endless misery? Impossible.

In his Epistle to Thessalonians, 4 : 13, he sets forth the resurrection of the dead as a source of consolation to mourners. He says, "I would not have you igno-

rant concerning them (not a part of them) which are asleep, that ye sorrow not as others which have no hope." Ignorance of the condition of our deceased friends makes many mourn as though their hearts would break. Hence, Paul, to comfort those who were mourning the loss of their friends, says, "Wherefore, comfort one another with these words." If Paul believed that some of their friends were to suffer endless misery, how could he use *such* language? It were worse than mockery to comfort mourners, by telling them the resurrection would be the means of *plunging* their friends into eternal suffering. How could we comfort one another with these words: O, merciful Jesus! blessed God! when I follow my parents, my wife, and children to the grave, and see their mortal remains drop into the narrow house, if they are so *bad* in thy sight, that thou canst *not bear* them in thy presence,—if thou dost absolutely loathe them,—in the name of humanity, let them sleep *on* forever! Do not disturb their peaceful slumber; for if they *are not* WORTH SAVING, *they* are not WORTH *raising*. And *don't* attempt to comfort me by singing your favorite judgment hymn:

> "There will be mourning, mourning,
> Parents and children there shall part,
> And part to meet no more."

O, my God! is this *thy* Gospel? Are these good tidings by which to bind up the broken-hearted? If so, may my ear be *deaf* that I cannot hear, and my mind *dark* that I cannot understand!

MR. TODD'S SEVENTH REPLY.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS: — The brother, in reviewing my remarks, says that "None will be saved against their will;" and quotes, "They shall be made willing in the day of my power." This is a worse difficulty than before. "Behold *now* is the day of

salvation," has been preached a long time. He says, "Whither I go ye cannot come," means they could not come for the time being. But I differ from him, and think it means *forever*.

Brother Lake quotes, "that we should render good for evil," and attempts to support his position by an argument from the precepts of Christianity. God never renders good to *us* for the evil done to him. God showers down many blessings on the wicked; but none the more because they are sinners. The precepts quoted were designed for man. Christ wished to teach his disciples to be merciful; to obey the precepts, that they might be like God. But his principles of justice and of law are as sacred to him as any other.

Again, he speaks of belief and faith in Christ; and on this point there is a great difference between his views and mine. I consider the belief to be an exercise of an active and strong faith, and I consider it necessary to salvation. We must believe that Christ is our Saviour, and our whole Saviour.

Brother Lake speaks as if I believed in an angry God. I do not believe God is ever angry as we are. Nor do I believe that all sinners will suffer alike through eternity. Let us suppose a case. Suppose an impenitent man died, who has committed but one sin, and the remainder of his life has been spent in doing good; he will not be visited with the same amount of punishment as the greater transgressor. The punishment is the result of a fixed and unalterable law, and the penalty must be suffered, unless atoned for otherwise. I do not believe in an angry God taking vengeance on his foes, like some powerful general going to battle. My brother continually argues, that a human being, with all his imperfections, and want of love and kindness, would not let the spirits of the damned suffer through eternity, had he the power of the Almighty. And he argues, that as God is better, he will be more certain to avert this evil falling on any, than he, or I, or you, would be. I ask, why

does God sit on his holy throne, and allow so much suffering and misery to exist in the world? All around us we see the squalid tokens of want and poverty and wretchedness, of vice and misery, of disease and death. Why do the Almighty and his holy angels look on unmoved? "God's ways are not as our ways."

MR. LAKE'S CLOSING SPEECH ON THE FIRST QUESTION.

RESPECTED AUDITORS: — In answer to my brother's question, in regard to the suffering of this life, I would say, the Bible teaches, "Like as a father pities his children, so the Lord pities our infirmities." Jeremiah says, the "Lord doth not afflict willingly, but for our good;" and for this reason he says, "The Lord will not cast off forever, although he cause grief." My brother asks, "Why does God permit sin and suffering in this world?" Let me ask, Why did he permit Joseph's brethren to sell him as a slave into Egypt? Why did he permit the Jews to crucify Jesus? To ask these questions is to answer them. My brother sees no difference between temporary and endless evil. 1 Cor. 4: 17.

My brother says, "God's ways are not our ways." But are his *ways* more cruel than ours? It is our way, if we see a human being in distress, to relieve him. But is it God's *way* to mock the sufferings of his offspring through eternity? It is our way to punish our children for their good. But my brother would have you believe, it is God's way to punish his children through eternity, without designing their good. If this is God's way, it is not a very *safe* way to follow. For the man that should act on the principles upon which the doctrine of endless misery represents God as acting, would not be allowed to go at large. "God is Love." His ways are better than ours; because he never retaliates, or punishes in revenge, as we sometimes do; and, hence, we are

commanded to imitate God, who "maketh *his sun* to shine on the evil and the good."

Having answered all my brother's inquiries, while he has left my arguments *untouched*, I wish now to ask your attention to "what saith the Scriptures," in reference to the final holiness and happiness of all mankind. To show that there is sufficient evidence for believing in the final salvation of all rational beings, I now introduce my *seventeenth argument*, based on the promises of God to save all.

Promise 1. To Abraham, God said, "In multiplying thy seed, I will multiply it as the sands upon the sea-shore, and in thee shall all the NATIONS of the earth be blessed." Genesis 22: 18. This promise was repeated to Jacob, the grandson of Abraham, in a different form, viz., "And in thy seed shall all the FAMILIES of the earth be blessed." Genesis 28: 14. In Acts 3: 25, we have the promise in a third form, viz., "And in thy seed shall all the KINDREDS of the earth be blessed." Now, if you can find a person that does *not* belong to a nation, nor to no family, nor has no *kindred*, he is not included in the promise. Neither can *you lose* him, for he belongs nowhere. But if all nations, all families, all kindreds, do not mean all, what language can you use to convey the idea of universality? Dr. Clarke says, on these promises, "Not only all the race of Abraham, but all other *families* or tribes of mankind *shall be blessed.* For Jesus, by the grace of God, tasted *death* for every man."

But will God *fulfil* his promise? He says, "I *will* PERFORM that good thing which I promised." In addition to this, he has pledged his oath to fulfil his promise. In Isaiah 45: 23, 24, we read: "I have sworn by myself; the WORD has gone out of my mouth in righteousness, and shall not return. Unto me every knee shall bow, and every tongue shall swear, surely *shall* say, in the Lord have I righteousness and strength." If the time ever comes when all shall

possess righteousness, it is enough; — the final happiness of all men is established.

But I have not done with the testimony of Isaiah. In the 52d chapter of his prophecy, we read: "All the ends of the world shall see the salvation of our God." And in the 25th chapter, we read: "In this mountain shall the Lord of hosts make unto all people a feast of fat things, and he will swallow up death in victory; and the Lord God will wipe tears from all faces." Paul applies this glorious prophecy to the resurrection of the dead; an account of which he gives in the 15th of the first Corinthians.

I pass to the testimony of David. In the 22d Psalm, we read: "All the ends of the world shall remember and turn to the Lord; and all the kindreds of the nations shall worship before him." Also, in Psalm 86: 8. "All nations, O Lord, whom thou hast made, shall come and worship before thee, and shall glorify thy name!" Those nations which God has *not* made, are not included in this promise. Once more. "All nations shall serve him: all nations shall call him blessed." Psalm 72: 11. "The Lord is merciful, and slow to anger; he will not always chide, neither will he keep his anger forever." Psalm 103: 8, 9. The advocates of ceaseless woe say, God will be angry forever, and close the door of mercy at death. But Isaiah says, "His anger endures for a moment, while his mercy is from everlasting to everlasting." Why is it that they contradict the plain declarations of Jehovah?

But I must pass to the testimony of Jeremiah: "For the Lord will NOT CAST off forever." Lam. 3: 31. And, yet, ministers are paid large salaries to tell the people that God *will cast* off *forever*. Again, God says: "I will *not* always be wroth, for the spirit would fail before me, and the souls which I have made." And yet, in the face of this testimony, ministers stand up and say, that God will be so angry with his poor offspring, that he will LAUGH at their sufferings through eternity. "Father, forgive

them, for they know not what they say!" But I must not omit the testimony of Daniel. In the 7th chap. 14th verse, we read: "I saw in the night visions, and, behold! one like the Son of man came in the clouds of heaven; and there was given him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations, languages, and tribes, shall serve and obey him." The same prophet predicts, that "Jesus shall finish sin and make an end of transgression." If the time ever comes when sin shall be finished, and all bow to the mild sceptre of King Jesus, what will hinder the final happiness of all mankind?

But I must not pass over the testimony of Ezekiel nor Solomon. The first asserts, in the 29th chapter of his prophecy: "And they shall all have one shepherd." This agrees with what Christ says: "There shall be one fold and one shepherd." And yet, we are told that there shall be two folds, and that the devil will superintend one through eternity. But blessed be God, the Lion of the tribe of Judah has undertaken to destroy him, with all his works! and we have no doubt of his ability to execute the work. But what does the wise man say in regard to the final destiny of the human family? "Then shall the body return to the earth as it was, but the spirit to God who gave it." And in the hands of God let us leave it, "in whose presence," David says, "there is fulness of joy." But the believers in the sweet doctrine of endless misery, are not willing to leave the spirit in the hands of its Maker; and so they frequently sing the following verse on funeral occasions, for the special edification of the mourners:

> "The soul returns to God again,
> NOT THERE TO DWELL, but hears its doom,
> And sinks to hell."

What blasphemy! And yet, there are many so ignorant, that they suppose this is Scripture language. Let the believers in endless woe produce one passage between the two lids of the Bible, which asserts that the spirit is doomed to suffering, after it returns to God.

Time would fail me to quote all the promises in the Old Testament, in support of the final salvation of all; but enough has been quoted to justify Peter in saying, "The restitution of all things has been spoken by the mouth of all God's holy prophets ever since the world began." Acts 3: 21. Allow me to call your attention to some of the evidences of the final happiness of all men in the New Testament. I will commence with the testimony of the ANGEL. "Thou shalt call his name Jesus, for he SHALL save his people from their sins." His people are sinners, for he came *not* to save the righteous, because there were none when he came. Luke 19: 10. Let us notice the testimony of aged Simeon: "Mine eyes have seen thy salvation, which thou hast prepared before the face of all people." Luke 2: 30—32.

Notice the testimony of John 1: 29; 12: 32; 17: 2. "Behold the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world!" If the sin of the world is ever taken away, what will hinder the final holiness of *all mankind?* "And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto me." John 12: 32. Let us now glance at some of the testimonies of Paul, one of the most distinguished Universalists that ever lived. He never used the word hell *once* in all his writings, nor is the *word* found once in St. John's Gospel, nor in either of his Epistles. Paul says: "The threatenings are not against the promises, neither *can* the law *make* the promise of none effect." The promises teach, the "Lord will not cast off forever." Lam. 3; 31. The Epistles of Paul are full of Universalism. Some, who believe in endless woe, have thought Paul was too *careless* in some of his expressions. In his sermon on Mar's Hill, he told the Athenians, "they were too superstitious. For God had made of one blood all nations." In his speech before King Agrippa, he said, "he was judged for believing in the promises made to the patriarchs." In his Epistle to the Romans, he declares, the "whole world shall stand guilty before God," and "*eternal life*," which is the gift of God,

shall be extended to all men. Romans 5: 18. Thus, boasting is excluded, and all are made, alike, heirs of salvation. "For God hath concluded them all in unbelief, that he might have mercy upon all." Rom. 11: 32. In his Epistle to Titus, he says, "For therefore we both labor and suffer reproach, for trusting in God as the *Saviour* of all men." In the 15th of the first Corinthians, Paul sets forth the resurrection of all men in a masterly manner. He says: "Some will ask, how are the dead *raised?*" He goes on to show that they will be raised incorruptible and immortal. "As we have borne the image of the earthy, we shall also bear the image of the heavenly." 1 Cor. 15: 49. "For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive." As the shell of the seed, which we plant, dies, while the germ lives, "so also," says Paul, "is the resurrection of the dead." "It is sown in corruption, (*how is it raised?*) it is raised in incorruption; it is sown in dishonor, it is raised in glory; it is sown in weakness, it is raised in power; it is sown a natural body, it is raised a spiritual body." "So when this corruption," the apostle continues, "puts on incorruption, and this mortal immortality, then shall be brought to pass (what, an eternal separation of friends? No; but) the saying recorded in the 25th chapter of Isaiah, "Death, the *last* enemy, is swallowed up in victory." Tears are wiped from all faces, and the song of victory shall be chanted over death and the grave. "Then cometh the *end*," says Paul, "when he shall deliver up the kingdom to God, even the Father, who shall be all in all." Such are the scenes which are to open upon us in the resurrection morn. All are to be made alive in Christ, and to be equal to angels; sin is to be finished; tears are to be wiped from all faces; death, the last enemy, is to be destroyed; and God is to be all in all. Alleluia, the Lord reigneth! he shall reign forever and ever. What transport is here!

With the *testimony* of the Revelator I will *rest* the argument, and proceed to draw the discussion of the

question to a close. "I heard," says John, "a great voice out of heaven, saying, Behold the tabernacle of God is with men, and he will dwell with them, and they shall be his people, and he shall be their God. And God shall wipe all tears from their eyes, and there shall be no *more death*, neither sorrow, nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain; for the former things are passed away." If endless sorrow and weeping are to sueceed the resurrection, how can it be said "THE FORMER THINGS ARE PASSED AWAY?"

"And every creature in heaven and on the earth, and under the earth, and such as are in the sea, and all that in them are, heard I saying, Blessing, and honor, and glory, and power be unto Him that sits upon the throne, and to the Lamb forever and ever." Rev. 5: 13. Professor Stuart says: "If this be not spiritual worship, I am unable to produce a case where worship can be called divine." A universe then, with joy, are to render unto God spiritual homage; and, at last, every knee is to bow to the mild sceptre of King Jesus, who is to be crowned "SAVIOUR OF THE WORLD." 1 John 4: 14.

In view of the glorious destiny which awaits the vast family of Adam, who can forbear exclaiming: "Sing unto the Lord a new song, for his right hand hath gotten us the victory. Be thankful unto him and bless his holy name; for the Lord is good, his mercy is from everlasting to everlasting; and his truth endureth to all generations."

[N. B. For some reason Mr. Todd did not deem it expedient to reply to Mr. Lake's last speech; but proceeded to open the discussion on the second question.]

SECOND QUESTION.

"Is there sufficient evidence for believing that any of the human family will suffer endless misery, in a future state?"

MR. TODD'S FIRST SPEECH.

I SHALL not attempt to reply to Mr. Lake's last speech. My brother, yesterday, kept me from bringing forward

Scripture in support of my views. I attempted to do so in *four cases*, and I will allow him the same number, *and no more.*

We say first, then, there are two distinct classes kept up in the Bible, chosen people — Jews and Gentiles, &c. Now, I hold that there is nothing in the world but has a correspondent in the spiritual world. This is the way God instructs mankind. In the Bible we see it plainly taught that there are two classes — two places — a heaven and a hell. My brother argues the existence of but one, but, I think, I shall prove that there are two. Just as they occupy two separate spheres in this life, they will in the next. The natural world is a type of the other and spiritual world.

I will now call your attention to a passage in John 15: 6. "If a man abide not in me, he is cast forth, and is *withered.*" Again, in Psalms, we read, "The wicked shall be turned into hell, and all the nations that forget God." Will my brother say this means the grave? Well, the righteous are cast into the grave too.

These are some of the passages which speak of two classes, and two places of destination.

[Mr. Todd here proposed that the time allowed each speaker be lessened. Mr. Lake objected, as twenty minutes was full short time enough for him to speak. Mr. Todd then said, he should not probably occupy all of his twenty minutes, as he did not wish to bring up many passages at a time.]

MR. LAKE'S FIRST REPLY.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS: — On the present question, the scene changes. My brother seizes the laboring oar, and, being on the affirmative, it devolves on him to show that there is *sufficient* evidence for believing that some of the human race will be endlessly miserable. On this question I have nothing to

prove. All I have to do is to take up the arguments of my brother, and show that they are insufficient to establish the doctrine of endless misery. If Brother Todd quotes irrelevant passages, or merely cites certain texts, and does not attempt to show that they refer to a future state, he spends his time to little or no purpose. When he quotes a passage of Scripture, it is his duty, 1st, to show it has reference to a future state; and, 2d, to prove it means endless misery. He affirms that the Scriptures teach endless punishment. Now let him prove it. To affirm that a kind father will take care and provide for his children, not only in time, but in eternity, requires but little proof. But to assert that a God of infinite goodness would deliberately call into existence countless millions, foreseeing that they would be losers by their existence, and will punish them eternally for the sins he saw they would commit in this life, is altogether IMPROBABLE, and *requires* the greatest *amount* of evidence.

Let us now see if the arguments my brother has adduced sustain the doctrine of endless misery. His first argument is, that the "Scriptures speak of two classes—the righteous and the wicked." Admit it, although the Bible says, "There is NONE righteous, no NOT ONE." See Ps. 14: 2; Rom. 3: 12. Jesus also says, "There is NONE good but *one*." But admit there are *two* classes. *Which class* did Christ come to save? Christ says, "I came NOT to call the *righteous*"—for a *very* good reason, there were none. Jesus, then, came to SAVE the LOST; for he says, "They that are whole need not a physician, but they that are sick." The physician feels but little interest in the healthy; so Jesus represents the good shepherd as leaving the ninety and nine, and going into the wilderness after the lost one. Luke 15: 4. We have no doubt but Jesus will bring back the last wanderer, "And there shall be one fold and one shepherd."

But my brother says, "The Bible speaks of two places—a heaven and a hell. Let us see. In the

first chapter of Genesis we read: "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth;" but we have no account of the creation of an endless hell. Besides, he pronounced all his works "very good." Isaiah speaks of the creation of a NEW heaven and a new earth, but says nothing of the creation of a new hell. Again, Dr. Clarke says, "Sin *constitutes* hell." But when Jesus *finishes sin*, destroys the devil, and restores all things to holiness, where will be this hell that ministers tell so much about? But, once more, the Bible teaches the entire destruction of hell. Hosea 13: 14.

But my brother quotes from the Old Testament to prove endless misery. Does he not know that Drs. Campbell, Jahn, and Paley, and other learned divines, have admitted that the "Old Testament" does not teach future punishment? In regard to the passage which my brother quotes in Psalms, I agree with Dr. Allen, an Orthodox divine, formerly President of Bowdoin College. He says, on this text, "The punishment expressed is cutting off from life—destroying from earth—by some special judgment, and removing to the state of the dead." Everybody knows the word hell (sheol) does not mean a place of endless misery, but signifies the state of the dead in general, without regard to their happiness or their misery. But does not my brother know that the same "all nations that forget God," are yet to remember and turn to him? See the 22d Psalm. "All the ends of the world shall REMEMBER, and *turn* to the Lord." Again, in the 86th Psalm, we read: "All nations, O Lord, whom thou hast made, shall come and worship before God." How can this be, if they are to be turned into an endless hell, and blaspheme God forever? Let us explain the threatenings so as not to contradict the promises.

But my brother quotes a passage in John 15th, to support the doctrine of endless misery. This will fail him, as all the rest have. "If a man abide not in me, he is cast forth as a branch, and *is* withered.'

On this passage, the learned Kenrick says: "This passage is designed to represent the contemptible situation (in the present life) of the apostles, in case they deserted him." Thus it refers to *this life*, and has not the least allusion to endless misery in a future state. Hence the passage says, "He *is withered*"—*not* will be *after death*. Here is the error of my brother and his denomination, viz., referring many threatenings to a future state, which were to have their fulfilment in this world. They forget, or overlook, the verb *is*, in the present tense. "He *that* believeth *not* IS *condemned* ALREADY." He *that* doubteth, IS damned,—*not* will be after death. For, in the resurrection, we are taught "All shall be made alive *in* Christ."

Although I was not obliged to explain these passages, which my brother has adduced in support of endless misery, yet, out of courtesy to him, and to show him that his proof-texts do *not* prove endless misery, nor begin to, I have paid my compliments to his arguments. Now let me state what I understand is the duty of my opponent in this debate. He says, "There are certain passages in the Bible which prove endless woe." I deny it. Now, by every rule, is it not his duty to take up these controverted passages, and *show* that they prove his doctrine? He says they prove eternal misery. But I cannot take his "*ipse dixit*" on so momentous a question as this. To illustrate still further my brother's duty; suppose the schoolmaster requires his pupil to tell him how many are five times twenty-five. He sets down the twenty-five, and says, Five times five are thirty. Who does not see, that as long as he says, Five times five are thirty, he will carry one too many, and make a mistake every time? So, on certain passages in the Bible, our opposing brethren say, Five times five are thirty; or, in other words, they take for granted the VERY thing which should first be proved. They assume that certain threatenings mean endless misery, which neither the original nor the context will warrant. When

my brother, therefore, quotes a passage which contains the word hell, let him prove that the word *hell*, among whom the Bible was written, meant a place of endless torment. *That 's the point.* He takes it for granted that it does mean thus and so; now let him prove it, and *not* depend upon what his father or his grandfather said. In this discussion we can take no man's assertion, not even Swedenborg's. We must have a "*Thus saith the Lord*," for every point advanced. I must defer my objections to the doctrine of endless woe, until I rise again; in the mean time, I hope my brother will buckle on his armor, and stand up like a man, in defence of the blessed doctrine of endless damnation.

MR. TODD'S SECOND SPEECH.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS: — I leave it to the good sense of the audience to decide whether the gentleman has answered the arguments which I have adduced in support of future punishment. He teaches me my duty, gives lessons in arithmetic, &c., and says he cannot take any man's assertions in this debate; to all of which I have no reply to make.

In regard to the two classes, he says, "There are none righteous." I admit there are none lawfully righteous, but Christ's righteousness is imputed to us. I say, also, that every one not living in a state of reconciliation to God, is a sinner. There are many righteous through grace; there are many not righteous through grace, who have not been made partakers of grace. Let Brother Lake deny it, if he dares, that there is not a difference in the two classes. I say, in one sense Christ came to save the righteous; for if it were not for him they would be lost.

He made but few remarks on the passage to which I called his attention in John. He says, it is *not* "will be withered," but "is withered." Now I ask if a branch is withered how will it ever come to life again? It is not natural. The withered branch is dead forever.

He says, it is my duty to prove that the passages I quote mean endless misery; that my "say so" is not enough. Now you will remember that I have been taking his "say so," during this whole discussion. I now wish him to take mine; and, as I give him the most time to talk, he will have the advantage. I stand here defending my opinion; he his. I took his opinion to be conclusive to him; I wish him to take mine. I will give him my opinion on a passage, and the inferences I draw from it, and he will give his. Neither are supposed by me to be infallible. He speaks of learned authors as proof, but they are not infallible either.

In support of future punishment, I will quote from Matthew 3: 7. "O generation of vipers, who hath warned you to flee from the wrath to come?" Again, "Every tree which bringeth *not* forth good fruit is hewn down and cast into the fire." Remember that Christ taught in parables spiritual things to the Jews; for by this method they could understand his meaning.

MR. LAKE'S SECOND REPLY.

I AM surprised at some remarks which my brother has just made. He says, "he took my '*say so*,' as to the meaning of the passages which I adduced in support of the final salvation of all men." By this I understand him to mean that the passages I introduced furnish conclusive evidence of the salvation of all mankind. And now he wishes me to take his "say so," as to the meaning of passages he quotes; that is, I must look through his eyes, and allow that the threatenings teach endless misery, when I do not believe it, and thus make the Bible contradict itself. No, I cannot consent to this. We came here to discuss whether "there is sufficient evidence for believing in endless misery, or universal salvation." I think I have shown, to the satisfaction of this audience, that the Bible teaches the final salvation of the world. Now

let my brother show that the Scriptures teach endless misery for any portion of mankind.

In my brother's last speech he quoted the following passage to prove endless suffering: "O generation of vipers, who hath warned you to flee from the wrath to come?" Well, what has this text to do with another world? Every respectable commentator in the land explains this passage as referring to the overthrow of the Jewish nation. *Pearce* says: "The *wrath to come*, i e., the punishment to come, is the destruction of the Jewish state." Dr. A. Clarke says: "The wrath to come means the destruction which was about to fall upon the Jewish nation for their wickedness."

My brother may say, "he cannot take the assertion of his own commentators;" let him prove, then, the "wrath to come" means endless misery in a future state.

My brother says, "The withered *branch*, meaning sinners, cannot be brought to life again." This would prove annihilation, which would be preferable to endless suffering. According to my brother, sinners are to be raised from the dead, and be made immortal, so as to give God an opportunity to torment them forever. So sinners, in the room of being burnt up like a *withered* branch destitute of life, will be converted into *salamanders*, and burn forever. It is a curious way to wither and destroy a branch, by keeping it burning forever!

I now will present some objections to the doctrine of endless misery:

1. It defeats the object of punishment. Endless woe neither benefits God, Christ, nor angels, and certainly it cannot benefit the sufferer, nor can it benefit those who are to witness the sufferings of their friends. What good does endless misery do? It is a superfluous, unnecessary evil.

2. There is no proportion between endless punishment and the sins of this short life. Besides, it is unjust to punish a finite being with infinite suffering. Besides, the doctrine charges God with creating un

born millions foreseeing that they would be eternally miserable. A demon would not commit such an act as this. They had better have slept in uncreated night than to have had an existence conferred upon them, which God foreknew would result in an endless curse.

3. But I have another objection to the doctrine of endless misery. It punishes all alike. The youth must suffer just as long as the gray-headed sinner. Suppose my daughter has this day arrived at years of discretion. She tells a falsehood, and this is the first known sin she ever committed. She dies unrepented of the sin, and, according to the doctrine we are examining, she has got to suffer eternally, — just as long as the robber, or pirate. Is this justice? Is this punishing men according to their works?

4. But I have another objection to endless misery. It reverses the order of things. It teaches a man may live a good Christian life, for seventy years, and then fall away, die, and go to hell at *last;* and thus he would be punished eternally for a few sins, and lose his reward for his many good deeds. The doctrine does not keep debt and credit. It is like the bankrupt law. It allows a man to stain his hands in innocent blood, and send a good moral man, like Dr. Parkman, to hell, and, while standing on the gallows, it teaches the murderer can repent, and *swing right* into heaven, and then can chuckle and laugh at the sufferings of those in hell. This is justice. For, Watts says: —

> "While the lamp holds out to burn,
> The VILEST sinner may return."

This reminds me of what a judge on the bench said to a criminal who had just been convicted of having killed an aged lady. "You," said the judge, "will have an opportunity of repenting, while the unhappy woman, whom you sent into eternity with all her sins upon her head, is deprived of this privilege." This is justice. The poor old lady must suffer eternally. In my next reply, I will show that the doctrine of endless misery

is of heathen origin, and that Jesus cautioned his disciples to beware of it, as they would the fangs of the poisonous viper.

MR. TODD'S THIRD SPEECH.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS: — I did not like my brother's way of spending so little time on the Scriptures I quoted in support of endless punishment. I think, I explained sufficiently, yesterday, in regard to there being no change after death. The heathen have been triumphantly alluded to by my brother. I believe the heathen have a law, — the natural law of conscience, — and I believe that they can keep it, and will suffer the penalty if they break it. None are to blame for breaking a law they never had; and if the heathen have not the advantages we have, they will suffer in a less proportion. Brother Lake says, that the promises are all literal, none figurative. Now let him turn to the New Jerusalem, — read of its breadth and depth, its gold and silver; — he may take it literal, but I shall not at present. I think this, and much more of a like character, is to give us an idea. But to return to the change after death. I did not say it would be a radical change, like the new birth or regeneration. I never have admitted, or *can* admit, such a change possible; but it will be like a growth, an expansion.

I believe that when we reach the eternal world we shall be progressive beings, taught by angels, or learning by intuition from the more advanced spirits about us. My brother's question, as to the future condition of idiots, children, insane, &c., is so ridiculous that I can hardly answer it. We both agree, and he himself lays special stress on the fact, that they will increase in knowledge. I hold that the idiots, heathens, &c., will go on increasing with the others, but still far behind them. The wise providence, which, for reasons inscrutable to us, ordained them fools or heathens in the natural world, thus prevented

their expanding like the rest in this life, and they will be consequently much less advanced in the scale of being on entering the eternal and spiritual world.

The brother has again remarked on the withered branch. I did not advance the idea that sinners were, while in this life, represented by the withered branch. It is only after they are cut away, after they have left the natural body, that the force of the comparison is felt.

The brother says my arguments have reference to Swedenborg. I do not call myself a Swedenborgian, but I have read some of his writings, and hope to read more, for I believe they contain the true doctrine of the Bible.

Shall I call him a heathen, because he reads us extracts, and draws arguments, from Socrates, and other heathen writers? Again, my brother objects to the doctrine of endless punishment, because, says he, there is no proportion between it and the sins of this life. I touched upon this objection yesterday. I said the proportion did not exist between the *time*, but between the *law* and the punishment. The law transgressed is infinite, therefore the punishment is infinite.

My brother says, it is not taught in the Old Testament. I would like to ask him what it meant, when God told Cain, that "if he did wrong, sin should lie at his door?" Was it a literal door? And how large a pile of sin would be likely to lie there? Was not this figurative and expressive of future punishment?

I will now refer to a few more passages. Matt. 5: 13. "Ye are the salt of the earth, but if the salt has lost its savor, it is thenceforth good for nothing but to be trodden under foot of men." What does this mean? Does it not mean that if we lose the means of grace, and reject Christ, we must be lost?

Matt. 5: 20. "Except your righteousness exceed that of the scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no case enter the kingdom of heaven."

Matt. 5: 22. "Whoso is angry with his brother, without a cause, shall be in danger of the judgment;

and whosoever shall say to his brother, *Raca*, shal. be in danger of the council; but whosoever shall say thou fool, shall be in danger of hell fire." I wish to ask what this means, if it does not mean future punishment?

MR. LAKE'S THIRD REPLY.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS: — My brother quotes certain passages, and asks what they mean. One thing is evident; let them mean what they may, they do not mean endless misery. For there is not one word in the passages about a future state, much less about endless woe. Take one passage he has quoted: "Except your righteousness exceed the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no case enter the kingdom of heaven." Now Christ taught that the kingdom of heaven was established on the earth, and "consists not in meats and drinks, but in righteousness, joy, and peace, in the Holy Ghost." We admit, if it could be proved that the time would never come when mankind would not possess better righteousness than the Pharisees, we should despair of their salvation; for, according to our Saviour, the Pharisees (who, everybody knows, believed in endless misery) were the most corrupt, hypocritical people that ever lived. But when the promise of God is fulfilled, and "every knee shall bow, and every tongue confess that in the Lord they have strength and righteousness," and all shall know the Lord, from the least to the greatest, we trust there will be no difficulty in receiving them into heaven.

In regard to the meaning of the passage in Matt. 5: 22, — "He that is angry with his brother without a cause, is in danger of the judgment," &c., — I beg to refer him to his own Dr. Adam Clarke, who explains the passage as we do. He says, "The 'judgment' MEANT the *twenty-three* magistrates, whose business it was to judge in cases of murder, and other capital

crimes. The council meant the Sanhedrim, composed of seventy-two elders, six chosen from each tribe. It answered to the same as our Supreme Court, which receives appeals from inferior courts." On the expression, "*shall be in danger* of hell-fire," Clarke says: "Our Lord *here* alludes to the VALLEY of the son of Hinnom." The word hell, here, is "*Gehenna*," which is a compound of two Hebrew words, *Gee*, signifying the valley; *Hinnom*, the name of the owner.

My brother asks, as though he was in some doubt himself, if this passage "does not refer to future punishment?" Let him prove, from this passage or any other, endless misery, and he will do what no man has ever done yet. It is a fact, which is kept out of sight of the people, that the most learned divines explain many controverted texts precisely as Universalists do. The learned Mr. Parkhurst, in his Lexicon, speaking of this passage on "*hell-fire*," says: "I apprehend that its outward and *primary* sense relates to that doom of being burnt alive in the valley of Hinnom," a place near Jerusalem, where the filth of the city was deposited, and a fire kept burning continually, to purify the surrounding atmosphere." My brother would have you believe *this* hell is in the next world. But the proof, the PROOF is wanting.

My brother quotes the passage, "Ye are the salt of the earth," in support of future punishment. That you may see what proof it affords of endless woe, I will put the passage in the form of a syllogism. "Ye are the salt of the earth, therefore endless misery is TRUE." What a powerful argument! I will dismiss it by simply remarking that learned divines tell us the *salt* means the gospel, which is designed to preserve men from corruption. But if man is totally depraved, there is nothing to preserve, and consequently God loved *total depravity*, when he sent his Son to save sinners.

My brother asks what it means, where God told Cain, "if he did wrong, sin should lie at his door?" "Is not this," he inquires, "*expressive* of future punishment?" I answer, unequivocally, No, no. And

this reminds me of *another objection* to endless punishment, viz., it is not taught in any of the five books of Moses, nor in any part of the Old Testament, nor in the New.

Now, if the doctrine of endless misery is true, where should we expect to find it first announced? Ans. In the beginning of the world, when God placed our first parents in the garden of Eden. But you may commence with the first chapter of Genesis, and read to the end of Malachi, and you will not find a single passage, which even intimates such a thing as endless punishment. So evident is this fact, that the most eminent commentators have frankly acknowledged its truth! Dr. Campbell says: "It is *plain*, that in the Old Testament the *most* PROFOUND SILENCE is *observed* in regard to the *state* of the deceased." Bishop Warburton says, expressly, that "In the Jewish republic, both rewards and punishments, promised by Heaven, were *temporal*. In no place in the Old Testament is there the least mention, or any intelligible hint, of rewards and punishments in another life." Dr. Paley says, that the "Mosaic dispensation dealt in *temporal* rewards and punishments, and that the blessings and curses," promised by Moses, "consisted altogether of worldly benefits and worldly punishments." Dr. Jahn asserts that the "Old Testament does not disclose (reveal) a state of punishment beyond the grave."

The doctrine of endless punishment, then, is *not* taught in the Old Testament. This is the confession of distinguished limitarian divines. And yet we are told that a belief in this doctrine is essential to salvation. What, then, became of those who never as much as heard of the doctrine of endless suffering? How could they get up revivals without the aid of endless punishment? Noah was a "preacher of righteousness," but never preached a word about endless torture. Solomon gives no intimation of ever hearing the doctrine, but at death says, "the spirit returns to God," (not to hell.) Jeremiah makes no mention of

endless misery, but says, "The Lord will not cast off forever." Lam. 3: 31, 32. Daniel said nothing about endless sin and misery, but says, Christ "shall finish sin, and make an end of transgression." Daniel 9: 24. David did not worry about the condition of the wicked hereafter, but said, when Amnon, his wicked and disobedient son, died in a state of intoxication, "He was comforted concerning Amnon, seeing he was dead." See 2 Sam. 13: 39. (Query — could he be comforted if he believed he had gone to endless suffering?)

Isaiah had but little faith in the doctrine of endless wretchedness, for he says, "Tears shall be wiped from all faces; death swallowed up in victory, and every knee bow, and every tongue confess." Isa. 45: 23.

So far from the prophets believing in eternal punishment, for any of the human family, Peter declares the "restitution of all things has been spoken by the mouth of all God's holy prophets, ever since the world began." Acts 3: 21. You will ask, if the doctrine of endless pain is not taught in the Bible, from whence did it originate? I answer, from the heathen. Where did the heathen obtain it? They INVENTED it. So testifies Cicero, one of their learned orators. In his sixth speech he says, "It was on this account, that the ancients INVENTED their infernal punishments of the DEAD, to keep the wicked in some awe in this life." Here, then, is the secret of the whole matter. The doctrine of the punishment of the dead is of heathen origin! The Jews did not find it taught in the Old Testament, but learned it from their heathen neighbors, or, as Dr. Campbell says, "As they began to have a closer intercourse with the heathen, they *insensibly* imbibed *many* of their sentiments, particularly on those subjects whereon the Old Testament was silent." Accordingly, when our Saviour came, he found the Jews had departed from the doctrines of the prophets, and embraced those of the heathen. Hence, he said, "Beware of the doctrine of the Pharisees." Matt. 16: 12. "Ye have made the commandment of God of

none effect by your *tradition;* teaching for doctrines the commandments of men." Matt. 15: 6—9.

In view of the erroneous errors which the Jews obtained from the heathen, we cease to wonder at the language of the prophet Amos: "Ye have turned judgment into gall, and the fruit of righteousness into hemlock."

MR. TODD'S FOURTH SPEECH.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS:—I agree with my brother as to the meaning of the word "*salt*," which occurs in the passage I have quoted, viz., that it refers to the gospel. But is it not evident that there must be some tendency to putrefaction—some exposure to disease—which the salt is designed to save from? If there is not *some* great and fearful disease, what is the salt for? The salt is to save, and I hold it is efficacious in saving the soul from endless burnings.

In relation to the kingdom of heaven, Jesus says, "it is not of this world;" by which I understand that it does not partake of the vanities of earth. Christ did not come to enact external laws, but spiritual. I said this forenoon, that Christ, when speaking to the Jews, used parables, because natural language was insufficient. And it is a common remark, among those who have attended much to the subject, that the figures he used are exceedingly simple, yet remarkably strong.

Brother Lake has spoken of the valley of Hinnom. I hold there is nothing in this world but forms a counterpart in the spiritual world. The valley of Hinnom is typical of punishment in the next world.

I will quote a passage in Rev. 21: 8: "But the fearful, and unbelieving, and abominable, &c., shall have their part in the lake which burns with fire and brimstone, which is the second death." How will my brother dispose of this passage?

MR. LAKE'S FOURTH REPLY.

RESPECTED MODERATORS:—At this stage of our debate, I wish to call attention to some assertions of my brother, which are entirely barren of proof. He says, "He believes the gospel is designed to save men from endless misery." I deny that men were ever exposed to such a doom. Where, in all the Bible, do we read of salvation from endless misery? We read that Jesus came to save men from sin, and from this *present* evil world; we also read of salvation from temporal evil—but where do we read of salvation from *an* endless hell? We are called upon to believe in Christ as the Saviour of the world; but where are we called upon to believe in endless suffering? Why! Paul nor John never used the word hell once in all their Epistles! What do you think of that? How ignorant many are of the Bible!

But, to cap the whole, my brother quotes a passage in Revelation, and assumes it to mean just what he wants it to, and then goes off in fine glee, and asks me how I can dispose of it. Now, on this passage, he assumes *two* things; 1st, that the lake of fire means a place of punishment after death; and, 2d, their *part*, which they are to have in this lake, is endless punishment. Now how does my brother know their part is endless suffering? Is this the part of all sinners, great and small? John does not say endless suffering is the part of any person; for, if it were endless, when the sinner had been in suffering as many years as there are sands upon the sea-shore, or stars in the heavens, he would be no nearer getting his part. Besides, John says, in the same chapter, "There shall be no more death, neither sorrow nor crying, for the former things are passed away." Again, he says, in the 20th chapter, that "they are to be tormented in that lake of fire DAY and NIGHT." Now is eternity divided into days and nights? The *fact* is, Brother Todd takes for granted the very thing which he should prove, in order to give validity to his argu-

ment. This is the defect in his reasoning. I now respectfully appeal to the moderators if I am not right. I ask the opinion of the chairman, if the passages which Brother Todd has quoted, have any bearing upon the question?

Mr. Todd.—I agree to submit it to the Moderators.

Mr. Lake.—What I want to know is, if Mr. Todd has not something more to do than merely to quote passages with which I am as familiar as the alphabet, and then *take* for *granted* that they mean endless misery, without proof?

Mr. Keith, (chairman.)—I think, in the first place, that this is placing on us a duty which does not belong to our station. Had either brother wandered wide from the question, we should have noticed it, and checked him at the time. I think, however, if Brother Todd simply quotes passages, without any remarks of his own, that Mr. Lake is not called upon to reply, or notice them in any way.

Mr. Bates.—My opinion has been expressed by the chairman, who has just sat down.

Mr. Lake.—The Moderators having decided that Mr. Todd has not advanced any arguments for me to reply to, I will now present other objections to the doctrine of endless woe. 1st. It makes the Bible contradict itself. God says, "He will not cast off forever." Endless misery teaches he will cast off forever. God says, "He will not contend, nor be angry forever." Endless misery teaches that God will be more angry in eternity than in this life. David says, "All the ends of the world shall worship before God." Endless woe teaches that many of them shall be cast into an eternal hell. 2d. But I object to endless misery, because it is licentious, and induces a spurious repentance. Hence the believers in endless woe are frequently heard to say, "If it were not for the fear of hell, they would rush into all kinds of sin — steal, lie, and cheat." It shows their dispositions. No wonder they say so, because they are taught that sin is pleasant, and all punishment is put off until the

future state, and if they only repent, they can laugh at justice, and escape all punishment. This accounts for the fact that the majority of our convicts are believers in endless woe. What would you think if our legislature should allow all murderers and horse-stealers to go at large, until they were seventy-five years old, and then, if they asked forgiveness of the governor, they should escape all punishment? This is what endless misery teaches. It produces a hypocritical repentance. It says, as the devil told Christ in the wilderness, "If you will join the church, and pay well into the treasury, you shall have a *seat* at God's right hand." Thus it holds out the fishes and loaves, as a motive to do right. On the other hand, it teaches if you do *not* do thus and so, and bow down to the golden image which has been set up, (Dan. 3,) you shall be doomed to endless burnings. Hence they sometimes ask, "What is the use of preaching if all are to be saved?" This shows the sordid motive from which they act. To escape hell and fly to heaven is all religion, with them, is good for.

But I have another reason, why I object to endless misery. The very means it employs to produce love to God and man defeat its own object. It threatens men with eternal hell torments unless they love God. The very threatening of such a cruel punishment gives God a *character*, to use the language of Dr. Channing, "we CANNOT love if we would, and ought not if we could." What! love a being who would take delight in witnessing the sufferings of his offspring; and, when he hears their doleful shrieks and cries, MOCK at them! Is such a being lovely, who could create, of the dust, millions, foreseeing that they would be endlessly miserable? Well, how does this doctrine represent mankind? As totally *depraved*, born into the world AVERSE to all goodness, and INCLINED to all evil? Is there anything very lovely in a TOTALLY DEPRAVED *being?*

But I have another objection to endless misery. It takes away the last motive from the poor sinner

to do right; yes, it paralyzes all his efforts to be good. On the ground of election, if he is to be saved, he will be—otherwise he must be lost in spite of all his efforts to the contrary. A Calvinistic divine told Murray that he "preached to a congregation numbering one hundred, while he believed only ten were elected, and every sermon that the ninety reprobates heard, only sunk them deeper and deeper into damnation!" So they tell the sinner that he is totally depraved—he cannot save himself—that he has no power to repent; and then, like the fox, they will cross their track, and tell him if he does not repent he will be eternally miserable. It is like plucking out a person's eyes, and then punishing him because he cannot read. Edwards says, "God abhors the sinner, and cannot bear him in his presence;" and yet he says God "reprobated them before they were born."

It is something as Lorenzo Dow said:

"You CAN, and you CAN'T,
You SHALL, and you SHAN'T,
You WILL, and you WON'T,
You 'll be *damned* if you do,
And you 'll be damned if you don't."

MR. TODD'S FIFTH SPEECH.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS: —I am sorry that there should arise any dispute between us, aside from the main question before us. I have the privilege, I think, of bringing forward my arguments in such form, and at such time, as I please.

He says, "The doctrine for which I contend makes the Bible contradict itself." So I can say the same of his doctrine.

It is not God, be it remembered, that sends the soul to hell. But the sinner chooses the road, and must take the end. God sets *blessing* and *cursing* before him, and he has his choice. Remember, God is a being of order, and governs by fixed laws. If the sinner, as a *free agent*, chooses suffering, the fault is

his own. The justice of God, in allowing the sinner to escape by repentance, has been alluded to before, and I may have occasion to speak of it again.

I will now quote one passage, to show the duration of punishment. Matt. 25 : 46. "These shall go away into everlasting punishment, but the righteous into life eternal." I will now refer you to the parable of the rich man and Lazarus. "And in hell he lifted up his eyes, being in torments." We see plainly that this was not in this life-time. This proves, too, that spirits, in the spiritual world, feel an interest, and possess a knowledge of the affairs of earth. The rich man requests that some one may be sent to warn his brethren of that place of torment; but Abraham said, "They have Moses and the prophets, let them hear them." Remember, my brother argues that neither Moses, nor the prophets, did teach any such place of punishment. But does not this prove that they did?

MR. LAKE'S FIFTH REPLY.

Respected Moderators: — My brother informs us that man is a "free agent." This is a contradiction in terms, for an *agent* is one who acts for some one else, and is not free to do as he pleases. Would God give just enough *free agency* to his children to get them into hell, and then strip them of it, and leave them there mere machines? But how *free* is man? Can he defeat the purpose of God? Can he thwart his plan? No. Man's agency is limited and controlled by circumstances. Solomon says: "Man deviseth his way, but God directeth his steps." Man cannot do as he would, because he is finite. He cannot fly, because he has not wings; although I once heard of a man who ascended a large tree with a pair of wings tied to his side, and, in attempting to fly, he fell to the ground, and fractured his limb. He said it was easy enough to fly, but the most difficult to light. This is something the way with man's free

agency. He attempts to do many things, but fails for want of power.

My brother quotes one passage to prove endless misery. "These shall go away into *everlasting* punishment." I deny, 1st, that this passage has the least reference to a future state, and call upon him to show that it has; and, 2d, I deny that the adjective "everlasting," applied to *punishment*, means *endless*, *any more* than when applied to hills, mountains, gates, priesthood, &c. Here is work for my brother to do. Let him come up to the mark, and prove that this passage has the least reference to a future state. I will show, at a proper time, that the parable of the sheep and goats was designed to illustrate the overthrow of the Jewish nation; that it was to have its fulfilment when Christ came in the glory of his Father, eighteen hundred years ago, during the lifetime of those who heard him; and that the word everlasting, being applied in a majority of instances to things of a limited nature, cannot be depended upon to prove endless misery. I will also show that there are other and stronger words, applied to God and the future state, than everlasting; and that punishment cannot be endless, as its very nature is *corrective*.

My brother next quotes the parable of the rich man and Lazarus, to prove endless suffering. This will fail him, as the rest have. And, first, it must be explained as a parable; second, the learned do not depend upon the word hades, which is rendered hell, in this parable, to prove the duration of punishment. It is grave in the original. Dr. Campbell says: "As to the word hades, which occurs in eleven places in the New Testament, in my judgment it OUGHT NEVER, in Scripture, to be rendered hell, at least in the sense wherein that word is universally understood by Christians. In the Old Testament, the corresponding word is sheol, (which occurs sixty-four times,) and which signifies the state of the dead in general, without regard to their happiness or their misery." But, third, the Bible teaches the destruction of hell; and

if it is destroyed, it must cease to be a place of punishment. Let my brother prove endless misery from this parable if he can. We believe the parable was designed to illustrate the great change which was to take place in the condition of the Jews and Gentiles; that the rich man is a type of the Jews, and Lazarus a type of the Gentile nation.

My brother assumes that the parable teaches endless woe; and then, because Abraham referred the rich man to Moses and the prophets, in regard to this place of torment, draws the inference that endless misery is taught in the Old Testament. And for the same reason that Abraham referred the rich man to Moses and the prophets, in regard to the place of torment in which the rich man was, I draw the conclusion that the parable does not teach *even* future punishment. For *where*, in ALL the writings of Moses and the prophets, could the brethren of the rich man learn about an endless hell? *Nowhere.* For it is EVIDENT, says Dr. Campbell, "that the MOST PROFOUND silence is *manifested* in the Old Testament in regard to suffering in another world." Now, if you understood the parable as we do, as illustrating the overthrow of the Jewish nation, the coming in of the Gentiles, &c., there is great propriety in referring the rich man's brethren to the prophets, for they had repeatedly spoken of the destruction of Jerusalem.

But if this parable is descriptive of scenes in eternity, why does not Paul speak of this place of torment in his account of the resurrection? He says nothing about heaven and hell being beside each other, so near that they can talk with each other. Paul says: "Flesh and blood cannot inherit that world." But this parable represents the parties as having bodies; eyes, they see; ears, they hear; tongues, they talk. And in the room of representing Abraham as rejoicing at his sufferings, the parable says: "*They* WOULD pass to the rich man, but could *not* on account of the gulf." If they WOULD relieve the sufferings of their friends, but could not on

account of some obstacle, they were *quite* as unhappy as those in hell! Who can believe that this parable is a description of the resurrection state? My brother wishes me to remember that God is a being of order. Well, I will! And let us see if he is a God of order in the light of endless woe. According to the popular doctrine, "there was once war in heaven;" and Milton says, they fought like tigers, but, finally, God cast the devil right down. Where? Into the garden of Eden, where two innocent beings were. Well, this looks like order. We have now found out where sin came from, viz., heaven, "that holy, happy place."

According to the doctrine of endless misery, God placed our first parents in Eden, on the supposition that they would not sin, but they sinned, and all their posterity. Well, he sends Christ to restore all men to their former state, and to destroy the devil; but the devil will prove too powerful for him, — he will come off conqueror, and sin will reign eternally, in opposition to God's holiness. A curious God of order this!

Turning from these considerations, let me present an objection to the doctrine of endless torture. It makes man better than his Creator. There is not a person in this house but would save all if he had the power. God has the power, but not the goodness. A good father will not punish his children any more than will be for their benefit, but God will torment his eternally. A vulture will take care of her offspring, but God, we are told, will laugh at the sufferings of his offspring. This makes him worse and more cruel than any demon on record.

2. The doctrine of endless misery makes God *changeable*. We read, "God is love," and good to all. But will he be good and kind in eternity, according to orthodoxy? Hear one of its advocates, Rev. Mr. Patten: "There God will pour out the vials of his wrath upon you. How will you tremble when the Lamb of God says to his angels, Bring forth my enemies, and slay them in my presence!" Curious proceedings for a Lamb that instructs us to bless and

to love our enemies. If Christ can ever slay his enemies, he cannot be "the same yesterday, to-day, and forever."

3. The doctrine of endless misery represents heaven as the residence of demons. Edwards says, "The sight of hell torments will increase the happiness of the saints forever." Spaulding says, "If I behold, in heaven, my dearest friends or children in hell, I shall clap my hands and sing alleluia!" Another orthodox divine says, "The godly wife shall applaud the King in dooming her ungodly husband to eternal suffering." Another divine says, "One part of the business of the saints is to laugh at the sufferings of the damned." Tertullian says, "How I shall laugh — how exult to hear the groans of those in the lowest abyss of darkness!" Listen to another orthodox writer: "The saints will look down and see their nearest kindred in hell, *unmoved*, and maintain perfect calmness and undisturbed joy at the sight." He says, "Such a heavenly temper must commence in this world." If this constitutes a heavenly temper, what would be a hellish one? According to the parable of the rich man, he had more benevolence than the saints in heaven. Professor Stuart asks, "How can we witness the sufferings of our friends in hell, and be happy?" He answers, thus: "God may, in mercy, *extinguish* our *social susceptibilities*." *There it is.* We are to be converted into *demons*, so that we can behold, unmoved, the sufferings of our children, and then we shall be prepared for heaven. May God deliver us and all others from *such* a heaven!*

MR. TODD'S SIXTH SPEECH.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS: — My brother, when reasoning on the probable course of the Almighty, com-

* Rev. Mr. Edmund, a Baptist clergyman, appeared before the Governor and Council, July 18, to induce them to put off Pearson's execution, so as to give him more time to prepare for heaven, in order that he might rejoice in view of the sufferings of those whom he had killed and sent to hell. This is justice!

pares him to a human being; and then asks, would a parent torment his children forever? But God is not to be compared to a *human* being. It is, at best, merely working on the feelings, to ask such questions. There is much in the world that goes against our *natural* feelings, but it is all permitted by an all-wise and good Being.

My brother quotes Clarke, and seems to believe it right to believe such a great man. Now I like him, and will believe him as far as I please. And now I will quote his comments on Matt. 25: 46. He says, "that some are of the opinion that this punishment will come to an end; but it will no more end than the happiness of the righteous." Now mark what he says, of the meaning of the word used in the original, which we translate eternal. He says, "It is the same word as is used to denote the continued happiness of the righteous."

But with regard to the parable of the rich man and Lazarus, I will read from Rev. S. Noble, a man of good authority. He says, "The parable represents the rich man as suffering the most exquisite torment, while it represents Lazarus and Abraham as being in the most perfect happiness. The bodies are representatives of whole classes, in their condition after death."

Dr. Clarke says, of those who, like Brother Lake, call it parabolical, that "they do so to avoid the argument."

MR. LAKE'S SIXTH REPLY.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS: — My brother says that I compare God to a human being. I do, and so does the prophet Isaiah. He says, "Can a mother forget her child? She may, but I will not forget." Here God's love is said to be greater for his children than a mother's for hers. Now place a mother upon the throne, and suppose all mankind her children, would she punish one eternally? Then do not suppose God

will. I do not compare God to a human being, for the purpose of making God more cruel than earthly parents, as endless woe does, but to show, as Christ told the Pharisees, "that if they, being evil, would provide for their children, how much more our heavenly Father will watch over and protect his offspring."

In regard to quoting from Clarke, I agree with him, just so far as I think he explains the Scriptures according to their original meaning, and no further. That he errs, sometimes, in explaining certain passages, is very probable; Job says, "*Great men* are not ALWAYS wise."

With regard to Noble, I would be pleased to know what denomination he is of?

Mr. Todd. — He is a Swedenborgian.

Mr. Lake. — Is it possible that my brother will quote from him, as being reliable authority? Well, let me examine the extract which was read in your hearing. He says, "The parable represents the rich man as being in the greatest torment, while it represents Lazarus and Abraham as being in the most perfect happiness." Now, let me read one verse from the parable itself, and see if Noble is correct. When the rich man cries for a drop of water, Abraham says, "There is a great gulf fixed, so that they *which* WOULD pass from hence to YOU *cannot*." Then if they in heaven WOULD pass from hence to hell, COULD *not*, on account of the gulf, they were discontented, and consequently were unhappy. For, if a *person* WOULD relieve a friend in great distress, but cannot, on account of not being able to get to him, he cannot be in the most perfect enjoyment. So the parable represents those in heaven as feeling for those in hell; they *desired* to visit them, but could not. So Mr. Noble is wrong, in saying that the parable represents Abraham as being in the most perfect enjoyment. If they could enjoy themselves, while hearing the shrieks of their kindred, they must have hearts of stone.

My brother has held up the idea, in this debate,

that sin is infinite, because sin is a violation of an infinite law. Then the boy that steals an apple is as great a sinner as the murderer, or pirate, because you cannot compare infinite. But if sin is infinite, how could Paul say, "Where sin abounded, GRACE did MUCH MORE abound?" Can grace go beyond a thing that is *infinite?* How absurd!

I will now state a few reasons why I cannot believe in endless punishment.

It makes God violate the precepts of Christianity. We are commanded to love our enemies; but Edwards says, God *hated* his before they were born. We are commanded to *bless* our enemies; but endless misery teaches that God will curse his to all eternity! We are commanded to render good for evil; but we are told God will render an endless evil for the evil done here. No wonder those who believe in such a God, act upon the principles of revenge. Calvin imitated his God, when he caused Servetus to be burned at the stake! This is nothing compared to endless misery.

2. But I object to this doctrine, because it builds up partition walls, builds

"Heaven on pride, and hell on spite."

It makes salvation to depend upon works. Hence the Pharisees of this day are heard to exclaim, "If all are going to heaven, I don't want to go there." Like the brother of the prodigal son, they think they are more *worthy* of heaven than their neighbors, and hence they say, "Stand by, we are holier than thou."

3. But I object to the doctrine of endless woe, because it either makes God a *cruel* or a short-sighted being. If we say, with the Calvinist, that he made a portion to be miserable, we make him worse than a Nero. If we say, with Clarke, that he *desires* and *wills* the salvation of *all*, but is *not* able to *save* all, we make him fickle, finite in power, undertaking a work which he knew he could not accomplish. This doctrine also disgraces Christ. It represents him in

the condition of the man in the parable, that commenced to build, but was not able to finish. So Jesus commenced the work of saving all mankind, and destroying the devil, but he will not save more than *half* for whom he died. Why did he undertake a work which he knew he could not accomplish?

4. But I have another objection to this doctrine. It dooms nine tenths of the human race to endless suffering. It says, only those can be saved who experience religion in *this* life. How many will be saved, according to this? The heathen, idiots, and infants, do not *believe* in this life; so they must be lost. And how many are believers, according to John Calvin's system? A missionary, writing upon this subject, says, "Fifty thousand of the heathen go down to hell every day." Six hundred millions more are on the same road. "Allowing," says a writer, "this horrid estimate to be correct, then TWO *thousand* and eighty-four souls drop into hell every hour, thirty-five every minute, and *one* every two seconds." If the heathen are not exposed to endless misery, why send the gospel to them? so as to give them light enough to doom them to perdition?

5. But I have still another objection to endless misery. It *destroys* the *peace* of those who believe it, robs the mourner of the *last* drop of consolation, and drives reason from her throne. Dr. Barnes says, "It is all *dark*, DARK, DARK, to my soul, and I cannot disguise it." Samuel Richardson, of England, says, "This doctrine has caused many to murder themselves, that they might not live to increase their sins, and thereby *increase* their torments." The amiable Saurin, a French divine, says, "I find in the thought a mortal poison, diffusing itself into every period of my life, rendering society tiresome, nourishment insipid, pleasure disgusting, and LIFE itself a cruel bitter. I cease to *wonder* that the fear of hell hath made many go mad, and others melancholy." In a work entitled "Orthodoxy as it is," I find two hundred and eighty murders, caused by a belief in endless misery.

This doctrine, too, is the fruitful source of insanity. It is impossible for the mind to contemplate the idea, that after the poor sinner, as Edwards says, has worn out the sun, moon, and stars, by his dolorous groans, his sufferings have just commenced. The following statistics will show the effect of endless misery: "In the Hartford Asylum, Connecticut, in 1836, there were one hundred and three insane from intemperance, and one hundred and ten from religion. In the Ohio Asylum, from intemperance, thirty-two; from endless woe, fifty-four. Of ten insane hospitals, three hundred and seventy-four were made crazy by a belief in eternal misery." Did ever the Gospel of the blessed Jesus make one person insane? No. It *restored* the *maniac* to his right mind; comforted the *mourner*, and produced joy unspeakable.

But the doctrine of endless misery is *doomed;* it must die, and when it is dead and buried, thank God, there will be no mourners; and God grant that it may never experience a resurrection! for it has produced trouble *enough.* It has broken many a mother's heart, and driven thousands to the verge of despair. Then let it go down to oblivion. So far from the doctrine of endless misery being taught in the Bible, we have seen, as Peter says, "the restitution of all things has been proclaimed by all the holy prophets." By an appeal to the word of God, we have shown that He has *purposed* the salvation of all. Eph. 1: 9, 10. He has willed the salvation of all. 1 Tim. 2. His oath is pledged for the salvation of all. Isaiah 45: 23, 24. Christ came to save all. 1 John 4: 14. All shall be made alive in Christ. 1 Cor. 15: 22. God will not contend forever, *nor* cast off forever. Lam. 3: 31. Christ will finish sin; destroy death, the last enemy; and deliver up the kingdom to God, who shall be all in all. 1 Cor. 15: 28.

God grant that this truth may be reduced to practice, and spread all over the world; and when we die, may we clasp this holy faith in our arms, — "*the antidote of death!*" Amen.

School of Theology at Claremont A11527

BX9946 .T6
Todd, B.
The Middleborough discussion : a debate

Todd, B

46 The Middleborough discussion; a deba
the doctrines of universal salvation a
punishment, held in Middleborough, Mas
June 26th and 27th, 1850, between Rev.
Methodist, and Rev. E.H. Lake, Univers
From phonographic notes, by T.D. Stets
Boston, Hobart & Robbins, 1850.
80p. 20cm.

At head of title: Read both sides, and then judg

1. Universalism. 2. Methodist Church—
and controversial works. I. Lake, E H
Title.
CCSC/m

1527